DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 130 SO 002 723

AUTHOR Thompson, Hugo W.
TITLE Report of a Feasibility Study on High School Philosophy 1968-1971.
INSTITUTION Central States Coll. Association, Evanston, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 160p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS Course Descriptions; Course Evaluation; *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Research; Educational Objectives; *High School Curriculum; *Humanities Instruction; *Philosophy; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Projects; Secondary Grades; Socioeconomic Influences; Student Attitudes; Suburban Schools; Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Role; Teaching Techniques; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Carnegie Philosophy Project

ABSTRACT

Described in this document is a three year project to determine the feasability and effectiveness of philosophy as a high school subject. Experimental problems are: 1) can philosophy be taught as a regular subject; 2) if so, how; 3) what are the problems; and 4) what objectives, methods, materials, and evaluation processes are valid and useful for high school philosophy? The project selected 14 college instructors, some with high school experience, to teach a one semester course in philosophy in 10 cooperating Chicago area high schools -- two inner city and eight affluent suburban schools. Nearly 2,000 students enrolled in one of the courses during the project, fewer students than requested the course. Feedback from project staff, students, other teachers, administrators, and formal evaluation teams assisted coordination and formative evaluation. Other reported aspects of the project and its evaluation include: school and community setting, course and unit patterns, teaching materials, teachers, classrooms, evaluations, and recommendations. The latter two sections are based on what was concluded to be demonstrated feasibility and effectiveness of the high school philosophy courses. (DJB)

ED 061130

Report on a Study by Thompson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Report of a Feasibility Study

on

H I G H S C H O O L P H I L O S O P H Y

1968-1971

Hugo W. Thompson

Central States College Association

supported by

Carnegie Corporation of New York

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The genesis of this project involved many people, but it would not have been possible except for the interest and generous funding of the Carnegie Corporation of New York. While the report and the views expressed here are entirely the responsibility of those who conducted the project, the results confirm the faith of both the Carnegie Corporation and the colleges in the Central States College Association that the potentialities of high school philosophy were worth a major study.

Just as the project has been a cooperative activity, involving a large number of people, so also the report itself. The organization and phrasing have been the responsibility of the Coordinator, with important editorial assistance from Francis C. Gamelin, and from W. Douglas Larson, who wrote the first draft of Chapter VI, Teaching Materials. The ideas are those of the staff, the students, teachers and administrators in the high schools, the Advisory Committee, and others who collaborated in many ways. Appreciation is due and hereby extended to all of these persons.

Full documentation, including teaching reports, minutes of meetings, memoranda of visits and conversations, samples of materials, and drafts of documents can be found in the Project files. Special thanks are due to the office secretaries, who got out all this material and kept the files straight.

-- Hugo W. Thompson
Project Coordinator

FOREWORD

To seek changes in institutions is to recognize their worth and potential. Thus, the CSCA-Carnegie project on high school philosophy was undertaken not out of disaffection with high schools but out of respect for them and a desire to make good institutions better.

This is not to say that American secondary education should retain its present shape. It cannot. But it has done its work well enough that many of its students now are ready for collegiate and technical schooling by age 16 rather than 18. As a matter of fact, new colleges which enroll only students of 16 or 17 are springing up and some old colleges are deliberately seeking a quota of younger students.

To introduce philosophy into senior high school curricula for the more mature students of our day appears as logical as the historic gravitation of collegiate curricula into secondary schools and secondary work to lower levels. However, the purpose of this study was not to transplant traditional college philosophy into high schools. A deliberate effort was made to determine what content and methods would best meet high school students' needs -- a cross-section of these students, not an academically select group.

The content which worked best and the method of "dialectic discussion" which evolved are well-described in Dr. Thompson's report. On the basis of his account there should be no doubt that high school students need philosophy. I hope, therefore, that the report gives major impetus to the adoption of philosophy by American high schools.

-- F. C. Gamelin, Executive Director
Central States College Association

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I. Historical Background 1

Chapter II. Objectives of the Study 10

Chapter III. General Structure and Operation of the Project . . . 19

Chapter IV. School and Community Settings 29

Chapter V. Course and Unit Patterns 52

Chapter VI. Teaching Materials 68

Chapter VII. The Classroom 82

Chapter VIII. The Teacher 95

Chapter IX. Evaluations 110

Chapter X. Affirmations and Recommendations 131

Appendix A. Student Evaluations of High School Philosophy Courses 144

Appendix B. Former Students Respond 149

Appendix C. Readings for High School Philosophy 152

Chapter I

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Philosophy as a High School Subject

American Experience. In 1959 the American Philosophical Association released a report on high school philosophy.* This report pointed out that philosophy has been a subject of instruction in secondary schools in certain parts of the world ever since the Middle Ages. In the United States, some independent preparatory schools, as well as some Catholic high schools, have included philosophy in their curriculum since Colonial times. Among public schools, there has been sporadic experimentation. Most of these experiments have depended entirely upon a special interest on the part of a particular instructor, and have been confined to very select students. The fact that such experiments seem to be increasing in number in recent years was part of the reason for having the study by the American Philosophical Association.**

The study document did not present a definite position in the matter, but offered arguments favorable and unfavorable to the development of high school philosophy. The committee made the following suggestions as to necessary conditions for success in high school philosophy:

*_The Teaching of Philosophy in American High Schools_ by the Committee on Philosophy in Education of the American Philosophical Association, C. W. Hendel, Chairman. The report was prepared primarily by a sub-committee composed of Douglas N. Morgan, Chairman, and Charner Perry.

**See also _Journal of Critical Analysis_, October 1969. The entire issue is devoted to high school philosophy, specially edited by Dr. Willis Moore of Southern Illinois University. Dr. Moore was of great help to the Chicago Project by sharing his list of correspondents on high school philosophy.

1. A professionally competent teacher must be found.
2. A community, administration, and faculty must be found which enthusiastically support the experiment in advance.
3. Intelligent, curious, and academically able high school students should be available.

The committee noted that the widest interest was in "some form of logic" and ethics.

Correspondence with the project reported here suggested expanding interest in high school philosophy. Inquiries came from two hundred fifty-five high schools, the largest number from the Midwest, the next largest from the Middle Atlantic states and far Southwest, and a significant number from every other part of the country, including Alaska and Hawaii, and from Canada. Seventy-two inquiring schools reported that they have a philosophy course. One hundred thirty-nine indicated that they would like to have. Thus, two hundred eleven schools reported that they have or desire a course in philosophy.

The courses now given under the label of philosophy have a very wide variety of content. In some cases the reference is to a portion of a course in Humanities or English or Social Studies. Some have put the emphasis on philosophical process, or "doing philosophy," and have tried to engage students in critical and philosophical analysis of contemporary problems and proposed solutions. Some seem more like a Great Books course or a mini-course in the history of philosophy.

Contemporary European Patterns. A staff member of the project reported here, Mr. W. Douglas Larson, spent six weeks in France, Switzerland and Britain observing work in philosophy at the secondary school level. Mr.

Larson was able to sit in on thirty class sessions, visit with teachers and administrators in these institutions, and have conferences with university professors and directors of major projects. He used a tape recorder to make a record of many class sessions and interviews.

In France, an elective course in philosophy is part of the system of education. Teachers of philosophy have a confident grasp of subject matter and give a course in formal philosophy similar to those given at lower college levels in the States. There are government-approved patterns for such courses and approved textbooks, competently and professionally written.

In England and Scotland the tendency seems to be more towards "doing philosophy." Sections on moral philosophy or logic may be introduced into "general studies" or "religious education." Some very competent studies are being made, and curricular material is being produced. Philosophers in the British universities seem to have little knowledge of or interest in philosophy at the secondary level.

Origins of the CSCA-Carnegie Project

Sometime in early 1966 various conversations led Dr. Pressley C. McCoy, the executive officer of the Central States College Association, to believe that it would be advisable and possible to develop a program for teaching philosophy in high schools. Representatives of several secondary schools and CSCA colleges responded positively to the idea and eventually endorsed an appropriate proposal. On October 18, 1967 the Carnegie Corporation granted $250,000 for "an experiment for teaching philosophy in high schools" to be conducted over a three-year period.

The Board of CSCA then appointed a project director and an advisory and selection committee consisting of the following persons:

Dr. John Linnell, Dean of Luther College (now Provost)

Dr. Peter Caws of the Carnegie Corporation (more recently of the Graduate Center, the City University of New York)

Dr. Donald Reber, Superintendent of Lyons Township High School

The Executive of CSCA (1967-68, Dr. Pressley McCoy; 1968-69, Dr. Lloyd Bertholf; 1969-71, Dr. Francis C. Gamelin)

The Project Director (1967-69, Sr. Dolores Dooley, BVM; 1969-71, Dr. Hugo W. Thompson)

This committee received a number of suggestions, including criteria for selecting project teachers, from the philosophy faculties of CSCA institutions. Interviews with teacher candidates were conducted in Spring 1968 by the Committee and representatives of high schools participating in the program. The selected teachers met once during the summer to discuss plans, and the program began in ten high schools in fall 1968.

Schools and teachers for the entire three-year program were as follows:

High Schools	Teachers		
	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71
Deerfield	Parejko	Otteson	Bosley
Evanston	Larson	Meyers	Birmingham
Highland Park	Parejko	Otteson	Bosley
Hyde Park	Hollenbeck	Larson	Larson
Lake Forest	Dooley	Meyers	Birmingham
Lyons Township	Bosley	Bosley	Wolfe
New Trier East	Thompson	Sweers	Sweers
New Trier West	Thompson	Sweers	Sweers
Oak Park	Larson	Hollenbeck	Hollenbeck
St. Mary	Hollenbeck	Hollenbeck	Hollenbeck

The CSCA-Carnegie Project differed from previous experiments in the teaching of philosophy in not depending solely on the personal enthusiasm of a teacher or administrator. It involved a planned feasibility study with

several teachers in several schools over a three-year period, so that many possibilities could be tested with a large variety of students.

The ultimate aim of the project was "to determine if the teaching of philosophy to groups of secondary school students effects in them:

1. An increased awareness of the complexity of critical judgments, and
2. An ability to grasp and formulate the philosophical questions pertaining to man and his appraisal of values."

Further, the CSCA Board and the Carnegie Corporation both insisted that:

1. The course should be referred to as a philosophy course for high school students and <u>not</u> called a college philosophy course.
2. The course should be one that could be used to good advantage by high school students whether they do or do not go on to college, and whether they happen to be or not to be in the honors group.

Moreover, early understandings with participating high schools were that:

1. The project would furnish the school with a half-time teacher for one semester. "Half-time" could be interpreted somewhat flexibly, but would ordinarily mean teaching two sections, and giving other services such as lectures in other courses.
2. Philosophy would be an accredited elective course not confined to the upper echelons of ability but open, at their request, to students down to at least the median ability in that high school. It turned out that from the beginning there were more students requesting the course than could be accommodated, so various kinds of restrictions were adopted, but not ability. In some cases seniors only were enrolled. In other cases it was a matter of "first come first served."

Developments Summarized by Years

Each teacher concentrated on developing a philosophy course which would relate to real concerns of high school students and evoke a response from them, but at the same time have significant philosophical content. Each teacher experimented with a variety of readings, audio-visual

materials, class patterns, and teaching devices. Throughout the project the staff sought to examine the potential roles of philosophy in high school and in life. This involved discussion of the objectives which were appropriate to high school philosophy, and the processes and instruments which were appropriate for the evaluation of progress toward these objectives. The following chronological sketch shows the progression of developments which are described in more detail later in this report.

1968-69. Very few of the teachers in this program had previous experience teaching in high school, though all of them had previous experience teaching philosophy at the college level. Several teaching styles as well as personalities were represented in the staff. By the end of the first staff discussion, however, it was apparent that there was agreement on a number of assumptions. Teaching in high school would be different from teaching in college, not only with respect to the age of the students but also with respect to the school setting and structure. Hence we could not offer the same course as in college, or even some portion of that. The problem was what the adaptations should be. It was assumed that some of the differences would be in the reading requirements and methodology of teaching. Each teacher would develop his own course, sharing experiences with others in the group. The first important task would be to connect student interest with significant philosophical questions. It was suggested that the basic pattern for the class should be discussion rather than lecture. Teachers soon noted the difficulties which students experienced with classical philosophical material and therefore began to look for readings outside the standard philosophical sources.

There were some problems derived from the structure of this project which

may be noted for future planners. First, teachers were secured on the promise that the teaching load would be half-time and they would have half-time for their own research projects. The teaching was so interesting that it was hard to do justice to research. The half-time load also was not a typical high school assignment and may have contributed unrealistic elements. Yet, the necessary extra work for an experimental project would have been impossible on a full high school teaching load.

Second, the lack of clear and full statements of objectives in the early proposals permitted early vagueness as to evaluative procedures. Even with clear objectives, problems of evaluation were difficult. Third, the use of college-oriented teachers meant there were special problems of adjustment to high school, which resulted in some fumbling by each teacher in his first semester. Discovery of an effective balance between too much and too little demand upon students seemed especially difficult.

1969-70. The experiences and discussions of the teaching staff led to several new experiments and developments in the second year. All used certain readings, and reported upon success or non-success with them. The agreed readings were: *Apology, Crito,* and "The Myth of the Cave" from *The Republic* by Plato, the first two books of the *Nicomachean Ethics* by Aristotle, the first two of Descartes' *Meditations,* and at least one selection from Hume or another early empiricist. Each teacher was to fit this material into his own plans for the semester. As it turned out, most of the teachers obtained a very favorable student reaction to these materials.

Concern to develop adequate evaluative materials led to several

illuminating but sometimes inconclusive efforts. In the first semester a pre-test, post-test process was attempted. Interesting information was gathered, but it became clear that no one on the staff was prepared to make a valid evaluative analysis of the results. As a consequence, external help was sought from the Institute for Educational Research of Downer's Grove, Illinois, and especially from Educational Testing Service. In addition, members of the teaching staff developed a student questionnaire that was given at the end of each course and group interviews with students were held in the spring of 1970.

New curriculum material was explored. Ron Hertlein and James Driver, who developed a new approach to religious education for Christian Renewal, Inc. of Crown Point, Indiana, presented to the staff a course pattern, charts, and teaching materials for study of valuation. Correspondence brought materials from experimental teaching of philosophy in many parts of the United States and Canada. Teaching materials used in various other high school courses were examined for philosophical material. Each teacher both sought and wrote material appropriate for his own classes. The result of these explorations was an expansion of lists of useful materials, as indicated later in Chapter VI.

Many special reports were prepared. Each teacher reported upon each semester of work according to an agreed format. Reports were prepared for CSCA philosophers and for Midwest meetings of the American Philosophical Association. Studies resulted in specific documents on "Qualifications for High School Philosophy Teachers," "Certification," and proposed lists of books for libraries.

It was generally noted by the teaching staff that philosophy had become

well accepted in all ten schools in the second year of the project. Student registration held high or moved upward in most places. An air of increasing confidence and sophistication was noted.

1970-71. In pursuit of significant project evaluation during the third and final year of the project, the Educational Testing Service administered pre- and post-tests in the first semester. A group from Gustavus Adolphus College was invited to visit and evaluate. Comments were solicited from school administrators, from students, and from staff. Results are noted in Chapter IX.

Beyond the task of meeting regular classes, the project teachers addressed themselves to special problems. There were special efforts to deal more adequately with logic, with philosophy of science, and with presentation of background for better philosophical understanding.

Proposals were developed for continuation projects to build upon the demonstrations of this project. Contacts with other schools were expanded in Chicago and Minnesota. A half-hour television program was produced on WMAQ-TV, Chicago. Three magazine articles were published. Contacts with professional philosophical groups also were expanded.

Toward the end of the year both the office and staff gave much consideration to final reporting of the work of each teacher and of the project as a whole. This document is a result of these efforts.

Chapter II

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Initial Aspirations

Humanizing Effect. An early outline of the proposed project offered the following rationale:

> In a technological and urban society, the need for perspective on the nature of selfhood and the universe is all the more urgent. An introductory course in philosophy for a selected group of high school students which might focus on ethics, logic or theory of selfhood could help in the humanizing process in an impersonal age. Such a course emphasizing informed critical evaluation could be of assistance to the student in his effort to determine the premises upon which his values are based. Philosophy taught well at the high school level might increase the number of students choosing to pursue the subject in colleges and universities. This, however, is not the primary intent of the program. The project is based on the assumption that philosophy has a vital role to play in the intellectual growth and personal liberation of students whether or not their intent is to pursue college studies.

Relevance. Sister Dolores Dooley, BVM, who gave creative and perceptive leadership as coordinator of the project through its first full year of operation, made the following comments in a report to the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in March 1969:

> At a time when students demand voice in school procedures and even policy-making, when criticism of traditional values and methods is widespread, a class focused on the process of critical judgment seemed a timely addition to the high school curriculum. Questions of value, selfhood, freedom and responsibility, the being and purpose of God, to mention a few, could be discussed with provision for criticism or the rational justification of certain opinions. The course was viewed as adding a distinct area of questioning to the curriculum rather than a cumbersome duplication of already existing courses. Curiously, but consistently, students expressed amazement and appreciation with the open atmosphere provided for discussion of life issues both personal, political and social. Some of the questions introduced in a philosophy class are bound to be controversial. Perhaps there is a distinct advantage in providing a context for discussion of "loaded" and perhaps even explosive issues, such as civil disobedience, conscience and the law, love and justice.

Meaning of Life. Mr. Paul Bosley, who taught at Lyons Township High School, put it this way in his report for 1968-69:

> The chief aim of our course is to encourage the student to develop a unified insight into the structure, the meaning, and the purpose of human life--in short, a philosophy of life adequate to the twentieth century. In pursuing this aim, the student is introduced to the importance of critical thinking about such basic questions as the nature of man, the nature of society, and the meaning of ultimate reality; and he is led into an exploration of alternative (and often conflicting) answers to these questions.
>
> Particularly important here is the attempt to engage the student in a dialogue with the materials and with his fellow students, and in the process to pinpoint philosophical assumptions important both to the issues and to the student's own thinking.
>
> In addition, we shall explore the contributions of some of the key philosophers of the past and present. This historical focus should assist the student in coming to a deeper understanding of his philosophical heritage, and in the process give him some of the tools by which to fashion his own philosophy of life.

Formal Statements

Objectives. From the very first meeting of the teaching staff the question was raised, "Can we define our objectives more clearly?" Several versions of a possible statement were discussed, and at the March 1969 staff meeting agreement was reached on the following statement:

1. To encourage students to inquire more analytically and persistently into issues relevant to their personal lives and to problems of the world.

2. In the course of this inquiry to:

   a. Pursue questions beyond the descriptive level to the examination of assumptions, to clear and logical statement of arguments, and to grounds for rational dialogue.

   b. Identify basic philosophical issues and openly discuss them.

   c. Use philosophical schools and thinkers holding views relevant to the issues discussed.

d. Equip students for examination of their own values, together with those of their society, through reflection, criticism and argument.

e. Examine alternative methods of personal decision making.

f. Develop such arts and skills as listening, fairness, and appreciation for complexity of issues; suspension of judgment during inquiry; and patient persistence in pursuit of answers.

3. To explore generally the function of philosophy in the high school curriculum.

Experimental Problems. At the end of the project, when the staff looked back, they agreed that they had really pursued the same problems throughout. These were phrased by Charles Hollenbeck as follows:

1. Can philosophy be taught as a regular high school subject?

2. Just how must a course in high school philosophy be taught in order to make it effective?

3. What kinds of practical and situational problems must be faced in teaching high school philosophy?

4. What kinds of student-centered problems arise in this effort?

5. What objectives, methods, materials, and evaluative processes are valid and useful for high school philosophy?

Staff Statements

On May 6, 1971 members of the staff presented a symposium on high school philosophy to the Western Conference on the Teaching of Philosophy in Chicago. The following references from those statements are pertinent:

Self-understanding. Students are assisted to develop a broader base for self-awareness and social responsibility. They come to understand the role of reason, both its needs and its limits. "The high school student knows that to be an 'I' is to be unlike anything else. Discussions on the nature of the self frequently have a remarkably penetrating and insightful dimension. This awareness can lead to a rather tightly held relativism

in which students refuse to recognize any standard of truth higher than their own opinions. This situation shows significant changes as they are exposed to philosophical material. There is a growing commitment to reason. They come to realize that there are more options for self-understanding and relatedness than either private subjectivism or slavish conformity to external authority." (Carolyn Sweers)

Interdisciplinary Relationships. Philosophy can help students see relationships between various aspects of knowledge and hence between various courses. "Courses are not now related to each other; as students say, they must flip their minds to move from one course to another. Philosophy can provide a significant interdisciplinary offering." (Caleb Wolfe) Note also the following conversation with a student on June 4, 1971: Student: "I could see why I was taking some other courses. I could understand the world better and see the interrelatedness of things. I would know how to write and develop arguments better." Questioner: "Do you really feel that you have learned something about the relatedness of all the subjects you have studied?" Student: "Maybe not specifically but there is a feeling about these relationships in our minds. We learn how to look for relations. Also it helps one work more logically instead of just saying 'That's how I feel!'"

Valuation. It helps students in their reasoning about values and in their development of a philosophy of life for themselves. "It can focus on how people reason about values, which is quite different from focusing on the 'values on which our country is built' or 'the values of science.' The existing courses usually try to move toward awareness and tolerance of difference, or try to inculcate specific values." (Caleb Wolfe)

Philosophy of Life. "The most outstanding characteristic of students is the hope shared by most of them that this course could somehow help in developing their own philosophy of life." (Paul Bosley)

Attitude and Technique. Philosophy is capable of a peculiar kind of openness. "As soon as we allow philosophy to be defined by a static curriculum, by a required set of readings and a single prescribed methodology, it will lose its unique significance as a discipline of open and shared inquiry. Teachers must be free, as philosophy itself is free, continually to re-examine and redefine the role of high school philosophy courses themselves." (Charles Hollenbeck) "The course should accordingly function less as an introduction to an academic discipline than as an introduction and invitation to an attitude of mind and to techniques of analysis." (John Birmingham)

Crucial Life Issues. Philosophy probes crucial life issues with a depth which is not possible in other types of courses. "It can be a starting point from which they can begin to probe these crucial issues of life that are significant to them and which philosophy alone confronts." (Michael Bennett) "Students move from an examination and understanding of the importance of 'me' to the importance of 'us' to the importance of the world and what is real to the importance of thinking and the importance of valuables." (Douglas Larson) The entire staff noted that this kind of constructive learning interaction changed everyone involved, not only the students but the instructors as well.

The Problem of Behavioral Objectives

An extended frustration in connection with the interpretation and

evaluation of the program was a demand that objectives be reduced to behavioral and therefore quantifiable and measurable terms. Part of the frustration arose from the fact that none of the staff were trained in the production of behavioral statements. The lack of skill led to unsatisfactory statements. Part of the problem was a conviction that the goals were internal ones, such as "grasp," "understanding," "appreciation," "seeing relations," and the like. It seemed inappropriate to seek standardized devices for quantitative measurement of such things. A further fear was that definitions in behavioral terms would "freeze" the project and prevent the flexibility still needed for effective work with students.

In several staff sessions in 1969-70 the expert assistance of Dr. Marcus Lieberman from the Institute for Educational Research, was available through the courtesy of Lyons Township and New Trier High Schools, who were clients of the Institute. Dr. Lieberman tried to help the staff develop behavioral objectives, but without usable results. The project therefore turned to other ways of evaluation, including an outside testing program by the Educational Testing Service. Details of the evaluations which were used in the project may be found in Chapter IX.

Uniqueness of This Project

In the course of these discussions there was further clarification of the special or unique function of philosophy among all the present or potential courses of study in high school and, more specifically, of the uniqueness of this project. Portions of the staff discussion were summarized as follows:

February 21, 1970: We have said in staff meetings that the high

school philosophy course should not be a history of philosophy or use the approach of systematic study of typical philosophical problems and answers. We have stressed the importance of discussion, involvement of the class in issues they find important, introduction of classical philosophical material through its relevance to current concerns. Does this leave us wide open to charges that we do not propose a substantive course? In what ways are we offering distinctive subject matter? How is discussion in a philosophy class different from that in any other class?

Answers here lead to the heart of the nature of philosophy itself. It never has been a separated substantive field in the same sense that this can be said of physics, economics, or Spanish. Philosophy is an approach to problems in all fields.

This approach involves a move from superficial (such as emotive or "gut" reaction) responses to questions, or from descriptions which may be detailed and profound (as in science) but still at the level of description, into analysis of assumptions and concepts that underlie the views and conclusions ordinarily drawn. At this level of analysis it is possible to undertake another kind of examination of issues for their consistency and validity.

Philosophical discussion may well have therapeutic values, just as discussion in another field such as history or literature may have such values if led by skillful teachers. But instead of using the event or the novel as a center for the discussion, philosophy will focus upon ideas and their validity. At this point it uses examples and materials from classical and contemporary thinkers to help clarify concepts, see alternatives, and demonstrate sound use of analytical processes.

Here, it was noted, lies the danger in philosophy teachers with inadequate background. They may be tempted into simple permissive discussion which reflects mainly the personality, attitudes, and views of instructors or individual students. Competent philosophers will do more than interact with a group, they will challenge it with significant ideas while interacting. Possibly there is some danger in the suggestion that a philosophy teacher should know something about discussion leadership and group dynamics. A teacher without enough maturity or background might not be sufficiently aware of when he was doing philosophy dynamically, and when he was doing group dynamics only. Students should be encouraged to feel free to express unusual ideas and positions, yet in a context which leads to philosophically valid examination of creative concepts and methods as well as conventional ones. The teacher must thus work on two levels, both that of psychological sensitivity and that of rational analysis.

May 23, 1970. Our function is to do more than clarify student subjectivism. We must indeed start with what they feel and think, but then push on to the recognition that their individual concerns and thoughts really are more universally human. These students are in the midst of a highly structured educational process and social

context. They are conditioned to be non-self-revealing. The philosophy class can be a buffer zone, within the structure, and yet open to self-revealing. In this sense, our job has an important psychological function of helping self-development through release. At the same time we must remember that we do not control the whole lives of students. Philosophy class is only a part of a larger context, but it can have an important place. One thing students are not sure about, but need to learn, is a trust that reason will not destroy the inner self of feeling and freedom. Students are interested in Existentialism as a philosophy partly because they sense that this viewpoint does not stop with pure rationalism but deeply respects the individual inner life. An inductive approach will start with the present personal responses and never forget or destroy them. But induction must move. It must go beyond the individual and specifics to more general understandings and judgments.

While many of the things which thrill students are simply a matter of <u>good</u> <u>teaching</u> regardless of the subject, there are some unique features of philosophy itself.

-- Philosophy attacks the problem of logical expression head-on and not simply incidentally.

-- It offers a new body of organized ideas and information with which to work.

-- It approaches directly the realization of personal and intellectual objectives, such as coherent knowledge of the world and coherent life objectives for the individual.

-- High school philosophy is a terminal course, a unit in itself. The student can concentrate on its direct values and need not worry about how it will prepare him for something else.

Unfinished Business

More attention needs to be given to the problem of appropriate measures of effectiveness in teaching philosophy to high school students, and this problem in turn requires clearer definition of objectives. The experience gained and the evaluations made in this project should be of great help toward such future clarification. Among the needs are:

1. Agreement between philosophers, educators and communities on desirable roles for philosophy in secondary education.

2. Clear statements of objectives, flexible enough to suit a wide

range of students and communities, but also definite enough to permit measurement of effectiveness in particular cases.

3. Some study of the implications of these roles and objectives for philosophy courses in high school and for philosophy elements in other high school courses.

Chapter III

GENERAL STRUCTURE AND OPERATION OF THE PROJECT

Role of the Central States College Association

College Support. There was extensive skepticism about high school philosophy among CSCA Colleges at the time the project was launched. Some feared that the program might involve long-range responsibilities difficult to sustain. Others doubted the validity of the idea. But after three years of the program and many contacts between the colleges and the project, there was strong support for the project and genuine concern for success of high school philosophy. Consequently, at the end of the project, CSCA offered to support establishment of a Center to foster extension of high school philosophy.

Executive Support. The three men who served as executives for CSCA during the preparation and operation of the project gave generously of their time and effort toward the program and its success. Dr. Bertholf and Dr. Gamelin also attended and contributed to many staff meetings. In their function as the executive to whom the Project Director was responsible, these men were especially helpful as fiscal agents for the project and as counselors to the Director and his office.

Project Director

Initial Functions. The first Project Director was Sister Dolores Dooley, BVM. During the preparatory months and during the first teaching year, 1968-69, she used the CSCA office in Evanston as her headquarters. An early statement of the project outlined her responsibility as follows:

1. Familiarize herself with each of the secondary schools and CSCA colleges involved in the program.

2. Act as liaison between applicants and the Selection Committee by receiving and processing applications for teaching in the program.

3. If vacancies cannot be filled by CSCA teachers, locate other able instructors acceptable to both the secondary schools and the Selection Committee.

4. Maintain contact with the philosophy teachers individually and as a group.

5. Observe and appraise relative impact and effectiveness of teaching in the program.

6. Develop appropriate curriculum materials in conjunction with program teachers and secondary school curriculum directors.

7. Evaluate the project in terms of its objectives.

8. Publicize the program in its various developmental stages.

Change. In the spring of 1969 Sister Dooley resigned in order to pursue her graduate studies full time. At the same time Dr. Lloyd Bertholf resigned as executive for CSCA, and the CSCA office was moved to Rock Island, Illinois, with Dr. Francis C. Gamelin as executive. A separate office was established for the project in Chicago at Mundelein College, one of the CSCA schools. At this time Hugo Thompson was appointed Project Director. He outlined his views on his role as follows:

> Sister Dolores Dooley has performed this task very well this year, and I would assume that the work would continue along the lines she has pursued. As I understand it, this would include contacts and clearances with CSCA committees and administrators, similar contacts with high school administrators, recruiting and assisting in selection of teachers for the project, chairman and secretary of the teaching team, preparation of materials, and other office work associated with all the foregoing tasks.
>
> In addition, during the next two years, I would anticipate such further activities as the following:
>
> 1. Work with the teaching team and others upon special projects such as these:
>
> a. Collect, test, sift a list of useful readings in

philosophy for high school students. A special publication may or may not be advisable.

b. Develop and test a handbook, teachers guide, and/or text. It may seem that a text is not what is needed, but some sort of guidelines, at least for teachers, probably will be needed.

c. Standards and suggestions for use of high school administrators. This would include standards of teacher preparation and other matters. This would require consultations not only with the teaching team but also with high school and college administrators and the American Philosophical Association.

2. Consultations with various high school authorities upon problems related to permanent courses in philosophy.

3. Consultations with some university about special programs to prepare high school teachers for these courses.

Major Functions. These statements describe the actual functioning of the office. Proportionately, major time and attention went to visits to schools and classes, preparation and followup for staff conferences, correspondence, and preparation of various documents.

The Project Director visited each participating high school several times each semester, attending philosophy classes and conferring with school officials. He also reported personally to the CSCA Board each year. During the academic year 1969-70 he visited the campus of each college in CSCA to inform interested people about the project and to discuss implications for the time when there would be a demand for high school philosophy teachers. Special visits were made to Illinois Wesleyan University in connection with a possible Title III project and to Valparaiso University to discuss a possible course on philosophical aspects of familiar high school subjects.

Secretaries. The full-time secretaries whose wisdom and efficiency

kept the project running smoothly were Mrs. Virginia Mulliner from the beginning until the spring of 1969, and for 1969-71, Mrs. Betty Ann Hillmann.

Teaching Staff

Selection Committee. The Central States College Association Board appointed an independent Selection Committee to choose a teaching staff for the project. In the second and third year, this Committee also served in a general advisory capacity.

From its first meeting on May 3, 1968, the Committee invited representatives of the high schools involved in the program to join the process of interviewing candidates. This process of joint interviewing was continued throughout the three years.

Recruitment. Recruitment of staff for the project proved to be more of a problem than was first anticipated. The CSCA Colleges were unable to release a sufficient number of teachers from their philosophy departments to staff the project fully, chiefly because the departments were not large enough. Invitations were sent, therefore, to other colleges to submit nominations for the staff. Other sources also were used productively.

Qualifications. It was decided early that high standards must be maintained for teachers in this program. All candidates were required to have a major in philosophy at the Masters level or above. A minimum of one year's experience in teaching philosophy, presumably in college, was expected. Each teacher was examined for contacts with high school youth that would lead to legitimate expectations of success in a high school program. As teachers were sought for successive years in this program,

and especially as the high schools themselves began to seek local teachers to carry on high school philosophy after this project, careful discussion led to a statement on "Qualifications for High School Philosophy Teachers." This statement was used for guidance in selection of teachers for the project and as a reply to inquirers.

Assignment. After teachers were chosen by the Selection Committee, the Project Director consulted each high school about which one to assign there. It was not always possible to give every school its first choice, but a very cooperative and generous spirit on the part of high school administrators led to agreements on all assignments. All of the schools expressed satisfaction with this procedure. Of course, in an experimental program not all teachers succeeded equally well in all schools, but there appeared to be no really serious failures. Three teachers remained with the project all three years--Paul Bosley, Charles Hollenbeck, and W. Douglas Larson. The other three positions were filled anew annually except in the case of Carolyn Sweers, who stayed with the project during its last two years. Hugo Thompson, who taught in the project the first year, served as director the other two years.

Selections. The qualifications and assignments of teachers selected for the project were as follows:

Birmingham, John T. (1970-71). Lake Forest and Evanston
B.A., Holy Cross; M.A. Northwestern; Ph.D. candidate, Northwestern
Taught at Wilbur Wright High School (Cleveland) and Northwestern

Bosley, Paul S. (1968-71). Lake Forest
B.S., Northwestern; B.D., Union Theological Seminary (New York)
M.A., University of Chicago; Ph.D. candidate University of Chicago
Taught at Simpson College

Dooley, Dolores Marie, BVM (Coordinator 1967-69). Lake Forest. B.A., Mundelein; M.A., St. Louis University; Ph.D. candidate, Notre Dame. Taught at Mundelein College.

Hollenbeck, Charles (1968-71). Hyde Park, St. Mary, and Oak Park-River Forest. B.A., Kenyon; B.D., University of Chicago; Ph.D. candidate, University of Chicago. Taught at Kenyon College.

Larson, W. Douglas (1968-71). Oak Park, Evanston, and Hyde Park. B.A., Gustavus Adolphus; B.D., Yale; S.T.M., Lutheran Theological Seminary (Philadelphia). Graduate study, Yale, University of Chicago. Taught at Gustavus Adolphus, Wittenberg, University of Kentucky, Northeastern Illinois.

Meyers, Doris C. (1969-70). Evanston and Lake Forest. B.A., Wooster; M.A., Penn State; Ph.D. candidate, University of Chicago. Taught at Penn State, Illinois Wesleyan.

Otteson, James (1969-70). Highland Park and Deerfield. B.A., St. Olaf; M.A., University of Chicago; Ph.D. candidate, University of Chicago. Taught at Gustavus Adolphus.

Parejko, James E. (1968-69). Highland Park and Deerfield. B.S., Loyola; M.A., Roosevelt; Ph.D., Southern Illinois University, Northeastern Illinois. Taught at S.I.U. and Northeastern

Sweers, Carolyn (1969-71). New Trier East and New Trier West. B.A., Simpson; M.A., Boston University; Ph.D. candidate, Boston University. Taught at Asheville, N.C., Puerto Rico, Simpson College, Boston University.

Thompson, Hugo W. (1968-71, Director 1969-71). New Trier East and New Trier West. B.A., University of Minnesota; Ph.D., Yale. Taught at Springfield College (Mass.), Macalester, Bishop.

Wolfe, Caleb W. (1970-71). Lyons Township. B.A., Tufts; M.A., Brown; Ph.D. candidate, Brown. Taught in high schools in Nashua, N.H., West Newbury, Mass., and Dighton-Rehobeth Regional School District.

Status. Since the teachers in this project were paid independently of the school budget, officially they were visiting teachers. Therefore questions of certification did not arise. Practically, however, these teachers were treated much as regular members of the faculty. They were not treated as student teachers under supervision, but as colleagues with whom there could be helpful exchange of ideas. The philosophy teachers were welcomed into the fellowship and activities of the faculty in each

school. They were assigned to departments largely at the administrative convenience of the particular school. Hence, these assignments varied, including departments of English, Social Studies, Humanities, and Classics.

Contracts. Formal understandings with the high schools, which had been oral at first, were put into written form in the spring of 1970, as follows:

1. The teacher's contract with CSCA includes agreement to fulfill the following:

    a. To fulfill the responsibilities of half-time teaching as worked out between said philosophy teacher and representatives of the assigned high school and approved by the Director of the CSCA Philosophy Program.

    b. In case of enforced absence because of illness or other unavoidable reason, to notify the appropriate administrator at the high school to which faculty member is assigned and the Director of the Project.

    c. To attend meetings of the staff of the project and perform such duties related to staff work as may be appropriate to the experimental nature of the program and mutually agreed upon.

    d. To submit to the Director a biannual report on work being done in half-time research or study as stipulated in the terms of the philosophy program proposal.

2. Cooperation of the school is assumed to involve:

    a. Assignment of a reasonable half-load of classes and students to the visiting teacher. This is normally interpreted as two classes per semester or an equivalent schedule, subject to local variations in pattern by special agreement.

    b. Availability of the CSCA teacher to other departments and classes for special lectures, meetings, etc., and encouragement of such use by school officers.

    c. Willingness of the school to consider philosophy as a continuing part of the curriculum, and appropriate preparation for it. This is interpreted to include appointment by the school of a local faculty member who will work with the CSCA teacher in 1970-71 and otherwise prepare himself with the expectation of teaching the philosophy classes thereafter.

When, in fulfillment of this agreement, local teachers were appointed to carry on philosophy teaching after the project, they were offered subsidies to improve their philosophy background through appropriate graduate work. In 1968-69, two teachers made use of these subsidies, in 1968-69 five, and in 1970-71 five. A variety of problems prevented three schools taking advantage of subsidies. However, these schools had well-prepared teachers to continue philosophy after the project.

Meetings. Staff meetings gave occasion for exchanges of experiences, materials, problems, suggestions, and general views about the role and potentialities of philosophy in secondary education. While preparation and much of the followup for these meetings fell to the office staff, the teachers gave themselves many assignments also. At the end of each semester they prepared a careful report. They reviewed and made many suggestions about each of the project documents before it reached final form. They constantly searched for new material to use in class or composed such material themselves. They kept in mind the possible usefulness of these materials to others, both within and outside the project, and shared them through meetings or through documents. They spent a great deal of time on evaluation planning as well as in gathering and reporting information. The result was a highly cooperative team spirit that contributed very much to the success of the project.

The staff also met with the philosophy departments of CSCA Colleges at their annual meetings at Mundelein College November 21-22, 1969 and at Augustana College November 20-21, 1970. On these occasions the high school philosophy staff listened with the college group to philosophical papers, then reported on their work in high school. Both the preparation

of their reports and the discussions which followed were a great stimulation to the project staff.

Documents

Numerous statements and documents were written in response to correspondence and staff concerns or studies. They were used extensively in replies to correspondents, in reports to professional groups, and in a large variety of promotional contacts. They were:

Annual Reports
- First Annual Report 1968-69
- Progress Report 1969-70

Bibliographies
- Philosophy Books for High School Libraries
- Experimental Readings

Certification for Philosophy Teachers in High Schools

Educational Testing Service Report

Evaluation of High School Philosophy

Former Students Respond

Memo to High Schools Interested in Philosophy Courses

Philosophical Concepts in High School Teaching (proposed graduate course)

Proposal for a Philosophy Curriculum Center

Qualifications for Teachers of Philosophy in High Schools

Questions Students Ask

Questionnaire for Student Evaluation of a Philosophy Course

Reports by Teachers (for every teacher every semester)

Special Project Reports
- To Central States College Association, January 1969, S. Dolores Dooley
- To North Central Association, March 1969, S. Dolores Dooley
- For use at American Philosophical Association meetings, May 1970 and 1971

Symposium on High School Philosophy at Western Conference on Teaching of Philosophy, May 1971
Brief special reports periodically to the CSCA Board, to the Selection Committee, to CSCA Philosophers Group

Staff Minutes
1968-69 - five meetings
1969-70 - seven meetings
1970-71 - seven meetings

Statistical Summary of Correspondence

Student Discussions, Summary of Suggestions

Chapter IV

SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY SETTINGS

How the Schools Were Selected

The Chicago area was chosen for the CSCA-Carnegie Project because it is central to CSCA and its high schools provide a variety of settings from inner city to wealthy suburb. The selection of particular schools depended very much on the response and cooperation of their school administrations and governing boards. As a result of their excellent response two schools in the Chicago inner city and eight in various suburbs were designated.

Inner City Schools

The Inner City schools were Hyde Park High School, part of the Chicago system, and St. Mary High School, a diocesan parochial school. Both of these institutions had been designated "experimental centers" which were seeking to adapt curriculum to the needs of the times and specific communities.

Hyde Park. Hyde Park High School serves an area known as "Woodlawn" which lies between the University of Chicago and Lake Michigan. It is almost all black and has been the scene of numerous eruptions, demonstrations, and street crimes. Large areas of older buildings have been destroyed, with only partial re-building. Students at Hyde Park rated Woodlawn as one of the worst neighborhoods in Chicago. This represents drastic change from 30 or 40 years ago when the area was dominantly white, professional, and middle class. Changes in the community had

drastic impact on the schools. Hyde Park High changed from 2500 white middle class students to 4000 mixed racially to, now, 1000 all black. When Kenwood High School began operation in 1968 it attracted middle and upper class college-oriented blacks and whites, leaving Hyde Park all-black and largely non-college-bound. Many students have educational deficiencies, either from earlier residence in the South or from weaker Chicago schools.

Hyde Park High School is controlled jointly by The Woodlawn Organization (TWO) representing the residents of the community, the University of Chicago, which administers an educational grant, and the Chicago School Board. The experimental emphasis has led to freedom and some very creative activities, but also to lack of coordination, sometimes bordering on the chaotic. The faculty has changed from an older, stable, academically oriented group to a younger, experimental, highly dedicated, more fluctuating group.

Hyde Park High School entered the Philosophy Project when Donald G. Blyth was Principal. He was succeeded at the beginning of this program by Mrs. Anna Kolheim who, with other members of the staff, cooperated wholeheartedly with the experiment. Teachers and registration were:

1968-69	Charles Hollenbeck	49 students
1969-70	W. Douglas Larson	58 students
1970-71	W. Douglas Larson	25 students

The 1970-71 drop occurred because of some confusion in course listing and registration. In 1971-72 there will be 80 students, taught by Richard McCullough, who worked closely with Douglas Larson in 1970-71.

One result of the flexible structure of the school was some confusion about the philosophy course. Students were not sure whether they were registering for philosophy or psychology. Attendance and preparation were irregular. There were interruptions from false fire alarms, student demonstrations, and local gang conflicts. Nevertheless, student response to philosophy was positive. In evaluative interviews, students here noted the same values and problems in the course as expressed by students elsewhere in the project. The teachers found these students intellectually competent and capable of creative, even profound, thinking and writing. One especially productive assignment, e.g., was to have them translate Plato into the language of the Woodlawn streets.

St. Mary. St. Mary High School (Center of Learning) is located on Chicago's near West Side, but as an experimental and diocesan educational center it draws students from many parts of the city. The largest groups of students are Black, Latin American, and Italian. Many come from families and communities which cherish ethnic identity. The school accepts these multi-cultural attitudes and helps individuals and groups live together. Personal and group tensions show in classrooms, but the school places strong emphasis on educational processes that recognize the special concerns and problems of each individual in an atmosphere of creative freedom. Though largely from low educational background homes, about half of St. Mary's graduates go on to college. Half of the remainder go into nursing or technical schools.

The school is located near the enormous West Side Medical Center, and also near areas that have been subject to housing blight, riots, and urban renewal. By becoming an autonomous experimental school in 1967,

designated to develop and demonstrate a new curriculum and educational atmosphere which could become a model for other inner-city situations, St. Mary seems to have found solutions to its most acute financial difficulties, but its program of educational experimentation carries its own problems of confusion and occasional experimental failure along with a spirit of excitement and enthusiasm.

Sister Patricia McCarthy, BVM, Principal at the time when the project was launched, saw philosophy as a natural and helpful element in the St. Mary experiment. She supported the project heartily and encouraged the local staff to make arrangements as helpfully as possible. When Mr. Calsue Murray became Principal in 1970, he continued this support and he sought and found a qualified teacher to continue courses after the project.

The project teacher all three years was Mr. Charles Hollenbeck. He related well with students and they described his classes as very helpful. Various problems, especially schedule, made it difficult for him to enter fully into the life of the school, but he was able to encourage and assist Mr. Marshall Arlin and 13 other teachers in an experimental core program with a large element of logical and critical examination of problems and alternatives.

Western Suburbs

Oak Park River Forest High School. Oak Park and River Forest have been established suburbs long enough to acquire some diversity in economic, racial, and cultural characteristics with an almost equal mixture of Catholics and Protestants. There is some industry, but these communities are basically residential and middle to upper class economically. River

Forest has a high proportion of professional people.

One high school of 4500 serves both Oak Park and River Forest. It has excellent facilities with a well-established reputation for academic excellence and a high proportion of students going to college. It also has experimented creatively with various alternative programs and has produced high quality programs for those not college bound. The faculty are interested in curricular innovations to meet new student needs. The school board and community, perhaps, are more cautious.

The school enlisted with the CSCA-Carnegie Philosophy Project under the superintendency of Dr. Gene L. Schwilck and continued full cooperation under his successors, J. Floyd Hall and Russell J. Fuog. Mr. Erle Volkland, Director of Personnel, arranged for group interviews with students who had taken philosophy during the previous semester and invited the project director to interview prospective philosophy teachers from the local faculty. Mr. Wesley Roehm, chairman of the History Department, was unusually helpful with his perceptive evaluation, advice, and encouragement.

The project teachers at Oak Park River Forest were:

1968-69	W. Douglas Larson	2 sections	64 students
1969-70	Charles Hollenbeck	3 sections	70 students
1970-71	Charles Hollenbeck	3 sections	73 students

In addition, Mr. Hollenbeck gave a voluntary non-credit seminar on Tuesday evenings during the second semester of 1970-71 at the request of students who wished to pursue some philosophical questions further. This group began with about 20 students. Under the pressure of spring

activities it settled into a half-dozen consistent participants.

The philosophy teacher in 1971-72 will be Mr. James Leahy who has an undergraduate minor in the field and has taken additional courses for two summers to prepare for this assignment.

Lyons Township High School. La Grange, the business center of Lyons Township, is predominantly a residential area for Chicago business. The population is middle class, with a strong white, Protestant, well-educated cast. It includes both an active John Birch Society and strong liberal elements, but has an overall conservative leaning in both politics and religion.

Lyons Township High School has a strong academic program and a deservedly high reputation. It is divided between the North Campus (older building, juniors and seniors, academic and college-oriented faculty) and the South Campus (newer building and faculty, freshmen and sophomores, more innovative orientation). Racial and economic tensions are more evident on the South campus than on the North. Both facilities are very crowded. The High School Philosophy Project benefited greatly from Superintendent Donald R. Reber's leadership and participation on the Selection and Advisory Committee.

Students at Lyons Township show that they have come through a good school system. Some produced term papers and special reports that would do credit to college students. However, here as at other suburban schools, a disturbingly large number were superficially motivated or negative about education. The tension between higher achieving students and those who wished only to "get by" sometimes became a difficult problem in philosophy

as well as other courses. One CSCA teacher noted that "those having most difficulty with the course seem to be hung up over problems of motivation rather than ability. Some of the factors appear to be irritation over pressure for grades, alienation from middle class mores, and personal identity crises." The problems of teaching classes with a rather wide range of abilities and motivations stretched the creative energies of all those who participated in this project.

Project teachers at Lyons Township were:

1968-69	Paul Bosley	4 sections	80 students	Jr. & Sr.
1969-70	Paul Bosley	3 sections	51 students	Jr. & Sr.
1970-71	Caleb Wolfe	4 sections	80 students	Jr. & Sr.

The teacher in 1971-72 will be Charles Hollenbeck, who participated in the project all three years. Preliminary registration indicates 110 students.

Northern Suburbs

Lake Forest High School District 115, Lake County. Lake Forest is geographically larger than most North Shore suburbs, but it has a lower population density because of many single dwellings, including large estates. Other North Shore suburbs have many professional and business management people, but the president of the corporation and chairman of the board live in Lake Forest. There are two colleges, Lake Forest (Presbyterian) and Barat (Roman Catholic). The community is conservative politically, socially, and religiously.

Lake Forest High School has outgrown its buildings. Plans for a new campus have occupied much attention from the Superintendent in the past two years. The students all come from privileged homes, although some of

the wealthiest families send their children to private schools. A high percentage of the students go on to finish college, and the curriculum is oriented to their preparation. These are serious and often excellent students, though a recent North Central evaluation team suggested that the school treats them as more remarkable than they really are.

In 1968-69 Sister Dolores Dooley taught at Lake Forest High School for the entire year while she was Coordinator for the whole project. In spring semester 1969-70 Mrs. Doris Meyers served, in fall semester 1970-71 Mr. John Birmingham. The cooperation of administrators was excellent. Special thanks are due Mr. James Morgan, chairman of the Humanities Program.

Philosophy functioned differently at Lake Forest than elsewhere in the project. There was no accredited course parallel to other courses in the curriculum. Rather, philosophy was one of five components in a non-credit, inter-disciplinary Humanities program offered to seniors. Since this was a non-credit course no readings, papers or tests were required, though some were suggested. The program consisted of four lectures a week and discussion groups on Fridays. The broad framework was historical, with lectures on the art, music, literature, history and philosophy of each period.

The Humanities course offered students an opportunity to explore ideas freely, to discover the interrelations of aspects of society, to show the current relevance of historical periods, to engage in an educational experience which would be interesting for its own sake. Some students reported that these goals were indeed fulfilled for them, but this enthusiasm was

not shared by all. Under the open, permissive conditions both attendance and attention dropped notably. Consequently, in re-examination of the whole Lake Forest High School curriculum, it was decided to terminate the Humanities experiment in spring 1971.

The original plan for participation in the Lake Forest High School Humanities Program was entered in good faith by all parties as an interesting variant in the total philosophy project. Philosophy teachers participated loyally. In the end it was their judgment that the format did not give an effective exposure to philosophy. An attempt to add a regular philosophy course proved impossible because of other curricular pressures. As a consequence, no base was established for continuity of philosophy instruction, so Lake Forest will be the only one of the ten project schools without philosophy courses in 1971-72. Because of many favorable contacts and impressions, however, philosophy may be re-introduced there in the near future.

An experiment which did not entirely fail yet fell short of its hopes may be helpful if analyzed. Project participants concluded:

1. If philosophy is to play a full part in an inter-disciplinary program it needs a base as one of the disciplines in the school. Students did not get adequate introduction to the nature and operation of philosophy through the scattered lectures of the Humanities program.

2. The declared objectives of the Humanities program were congruent with those of philosophy. But the no-credit, no-assignments, no-requirements features of the course created an isolated situation in the midst of a high-achievement-pressure curriculum.

3. Reliance of the Humanities program upon lectures, probably the least efficient educational device used in high schools, proved ineffective. Reading, discussion, writing papers, and giving reports should be part of a process of interaction between students and with faculty. Without them, Friday discussions tended to be empty.

4. Philosophy as a synthesizing discipline is able to serve as a valuable core element in an integrative inter-disciplinary course. The problem is to devise the best operational pattern for performance of this role. One of our teachers suggested that possibly a philosopher in such a program should serve as analyst and catalyst, showing the foundations and relations of materials presented by other lecturers rather than adding another lecture on historical examples of philosophical thought. Such a role would be very demanding. It would require a broad background on the part of the philosopher and very understanding cooperation on the part of other team members.

5. Each project member who participated at Lake Forest High School felt drawn to the purposes of the Humanities program and would like to participate in some such course with modifications. Each teacher also participated as guest lecturer in several other courses at appropriate points. They thought they were useful in this way.

Highland Park High School, District 113, Lake County. Highland Park High School serves 2500 students from the communities of Highland Park, Highwood, and Fort Sheridan. These communities involve a total population of over 70,000 and considerable economic and social variety. Highland Park itself contains a highly affluent population. Among North Shore communities it is somewhat older, well established, professionally oriented, with highly educated families, dominantly Jewish. Highwood is more a working class community with a large percentage of Italian, Roman Catholic people. Fort Sheridan, a military base, has a mixed and somewhat transient population. Students from all these areas give Highland Park High School a rather cosmopolitan and open character. The students are challenging and agressively motivated, highly stimulating to the teachers. Some of them do amazingly high quality work, as for instance one who wrote a competent paper on the relation of mathematics and philosophy based on Russell, Whitehead and others.

Project teachers at Highland Park were:

1968-69	James Parejko	4 sections	80 students
1969-70	James Otteson	3 sections	100 students
	Ralph Cianchetti (local)	1 section	25 students
1970-71	Paul Bosley	3 sections	76 students
	Tom Kysilko (local)	1 section	30 students

The first of these teachers, James Parejko, was very popular with students. His successor, James Otteson, was a very conscientious teacher, aware of faculty doubts about philosophy, sensitive to strengths and weaknesses in the class, and adaptive. He tried many experiments in method and content, including revisions of his own first plans for the semester. The fact that he taught a more structured class than his predecessor led to some frustration of student expectations, but his class was well received in the end. Because of large student interest developed by Parejko, Otteson's classes were supplemented by a section under Ralph Cianchetti, a widely read and excellent English teacher.

In 1970-71 Paul Bosley became the project teacher. He had two years of experience at Lyons Township as well as previous college experience. His warm personality and academic competence endeared him to both faculty and students. To work with him, Tom Kysilko was recruited for the regular teaching staff of the school in both mathematics and philosophy. He conferred frequently with Bosley but took full responsibility for his own section. In his first year of teaching he did very well and showed high promise for the future. In 1971-72 he will have four sections of philosophy with 100 students each semester.

Deerfield High School, District 113, Lake County. Deerfield High School serves the western part of the same school district as Highland Park High School, including part of Highland Park, Deerfield, and Bannockburn.

The area includes a high proportion of newly wealthy people, predominantly white, Christian, and politically conservative. The students are competent and eager. The school administration and faculty are very progressive educationally, eager to be the best. The buildings are new and very well equipped for modern educational techniques, including multi-media presentations and arrangements for small discussion groups as well as large classes.

The teachers at Deerfield were:

1968-69	James Parejko	5 sections	75 students
1969-70	James Otteson	large & small groups	75 students
	Michael Knight (local) 1st sem.	2 sections	50 students
	Michael Knight, 2nd semester	2 sections	60 students
1970-71	Paul Bosley	large & small groups	65 students
	Michael Knight (local) 1st sem.	2 sections	50 students
	Michael Knight, 2nd semester	3 sections	75 students

1971-72 Michael Knight, who also teaches economics, will continue teaching the philosophy courses with approximately 1/4 of the senior class enrolled.

Mr. Parejko, as the first philosophy teacher at the school, stimulated a great deal of student interest in philosophy. Mr. Otteson, in the second year of the project, made use of his extensive background in psychology as well as philosophy in discussions of various life styles and was well received. Because enrollments exceeded what he could handle, Michael Knight taught two sections each semester. An economics teacher with an undergraduate minor in philosophy, Mr. Knight took additional work in philosophy during three summer schools to prepare himself to go on with philosophy classes at Deerfield.

In 1970-71, Paul Bosley taught a group of 65 students in a combination of large lecture sessions and small discussion groups. He also made use of

audio-visual presentations and became a very popular teacher. At the same time, Mr. Knight taught two and three sections of philosophy. The total number of all philosophy students in the year was 190, the largest single-year enrollment of any project school. Philosophy seems well established at Deerfield and should continue strong under the competent teaching of Mr. Knight.

The administrative officers in Deerfield and Highland Park were very cooperative and helpful. Those most actively related to the program were Harold Perry, Curriculum Director for the system; Theodor Repsholdt and Robert Benson, each of whom served as Principal for Deerfield; and Arthur Gosling, Principal, and Shirley Hartz, Assistant Principal at Highland Park. The Social Studies Department chairmen, Dr. Hildreth Spencer at Highland Park and Joseph Hajost at Deerfield, were especially helpful. In this school system, policy and practice were adapted unusually well to student interest, as shown in the philosophy enrollment noted above.

New Trier High Schools, East and West. New Trier Township includes Wilmette, Kenilworth, Winnetka, Glencoe, and Northfield. Initially New Trier East served the entire area and gained a national reputation for excellence. When the student body outgrew the building, New Trier West was built to serve the western part of the area. The name "new Trier" was used to help maintain continuity of traditions, and a significant part of the faculty for West was recruited from established teachers at East. The new buildings were designed for the full range of modern teaching techniques, with some of the new developments such as closed circuit television shared with East.

The population of this entire area would be listed as middle to upper middle and upper class in affluence. These are established, educated, cultured people and very conscious of it. Politically the area is dominantly conservative with enough "liberals" to create realistic tensions. Citizens are very proud of their schools and have sustained a high per capita expenditure for education through many years.

Students at both schools come from educated, affluent, ambitious homes. Most of them assume college as the next stage in their careers. Many are Merit Scholars.

In every semester there was more demand than space in philosophy classes, so they were restricted to seniors, but they remained open to a wide range of ability levels. Project teachers were:

		West, 1st Sem.	East, 2nd Sem.
1968-69	Hugo Thompson	33 students, 1 section	46 students, 2 sections
1969-70	Carolyn Sweers	60 students, 2 sections	60 students, 2 sections
1970-71	Carolyn Sweers	60 students, 2 sections	85 students, 3 sections

Reports from students, faculty, and administrators indicate very high regard for the work of both project teachers. The fact that Miss Sweers was asked to continue on the faculty is one evidence of her support by faculty and administration, but even more striking was the response of students. In a poll at New Trier West on teaching effectiveness, Miss Sweers was rated highest not only in her department but in the whole school. She will continue at New Trier East in 1971-72, and Pat Flaherty will undertake philosophy at New Trier West.

Budget tightening created problems for the continuation of the program at

these schools, but the success of the pilot project coupled with administrative and board support were determinative.

Some of the earliest suggestions for the project came from Ralph McGee, Principal at New Trier East. The project has had enthusiastic support throughout from him and from William Cornog, Superintendent; Leonard Schweitzer and David Cox, Principals at West; and in day-to-day affairs from Ann Albert and Evelyn Patterson, department chairmen at West and East.

Evanston Township High School. Evanston is one of the oldest and most cosmopolitan of the affluent North Shore suburbs of Chicago. It has a population of approximately 95,000 and a mean income level of $11,000. It is national headquarters for Rotary International and W.C.T.U. and the site of Northwestern University. There is a strong community life with an historical society, a civic orchestra, and good social agencies. The population is mixed, approximately 20% each of Blacks, Roman Catholic, and Jewish, with the remainder Protestant White. Some tensions between these groups have surfaced recently in connection with school policies and finance.

Evanston has a four-in-one high school, with 5300 students divided into four semi-autonomous schools housed in one complex of buildings. The teaching staff for most disciplines is divided among the various schools with a central supervisor for each subject. Some specialized offerings are given in one school only but are open to students from the other schools. Modular scheduling is used. The Evanston schools are of high quality and reputation.

Administrative officers have given hearty and thoughtful cooperation to the High School Philosophy Project. Dr. Scott Thomson, Superintendent, Dr. Donald Torreson, Assistant Superintendent, and Mr. Clarence Hach, Supervisor of English for the four schools, all have been supportive and helpful, with Mr. Hach as the most active contact.

Teachers from the CSCA-Carnegie High School Philosophy Project have been:

1968-69	W. Douglas Larson	3 sections	64 students
1969-70	Mrs. Doris Meyers	2 sections	50 students
1970-71	John Birmingham	2 sections	60 students

All these teachers made good impressions and were impressed in turn by the capacity and response of the students. Perhaps the strongest impact was that of Mrs. Meyers, who was a very dynamic teacher, an active individual counselor, and an interested participant in other aspects of school life. Mr. Larson and Mr. Birmingham were challenging to students and keenly analytical of classroom operations. They were especially helpful in meetings of the project staff. Recent financial pressures created severe problems for the continuation of philosophy, but a creative adjustment made it possible--in 1971-72 philosophy will be one of several electives which satisfy the senior English requirement. Mr. Michael Bennett, who has been a member of the English Department for four years and is a doctoral student at Northwestern University with a major in English and strong minor in philosophy, will teach half-semester mini-courses in each of the four high schools in 1971-72. There have been 110 student applications. The mini-course pattern will be an interesting experiment in itself worth watching.

Comparisons and Contrasts

Types of Communities. The communities served by the Philosophy Project, with concomitant variations in student constituencies, ranged from inner-city poverty areas to areas of very high affluence. Between areas there were interesting differences. The major ones affecting the classroom were economic rather than racial or ethnic.

The two Inner City schools served students from predominantly low economic levels. Hyde Park High School and its community are Black, while St. Mary's and its community are very mixed ethnically. In both cases there is marked turmoil of change with an atmosphere of uneasy suspicion of all that pertains to "the establishment." Not only students but their parents tend to assume that the economic, political, and social structures of society operate against them rather than for their basic welfare. Within the vicinity of both schools there have been riots, burnings, and frequent street crimes. Community rebelliousness does not begin in the schools but is reflected there in slogans, demonstrations, and classroom attitudes.

At the same time these young people seek success and happiness. They see no better available way to secure these than through the schools and established social processes. Hence they are ambivalently motivated, desiring academic success but hating the process and implications of this kind of achievement. In their evaluative comments the things they emphasized most as values of philosophy were a better understanding of themselves, a more sensitive and appreciative acceptance of the differing views of other people, a clarification of life purposes, and an understanding of reasons for the balance and tension between personal

and social interests.

In the suburban communities, the older generation is the establishment. Hence the rebellion of youth is not in concert with their parents but against them. Parents and community authorities are disturbed at contemporary challenges to ways of life that have helped them climb to suburban success. They are disturbed that neither home nor school influence seems able to assure those drives in the youth which their elders deem so essential. In a discussion with a parent group about the possibilities of philosophy in high school, one father commented, "These kids do need to be taught ethics," but he was not so sure about critical thinking because "they are too critical already." In another school a whispering campaign became a significant factor in a school bond election. The whisper was that "there is an atheist on the faculty." When traced, the rumor appeared to have come from a class in which the philosophy teacher had spoken about the influence of Puritanism on American literature. The lecture included comments about some elements of Puritanism that are generally rejected today and some that ought to be preserved. After class one student thanked him earnestly for his "defense of the Christian faith," but evidently others thought he was too "critical" and their reports gave rise to rumors of atheism.

Suburban students feel pressured for grades, for college, for success. They resent the pressure partly because they want freedom but partly also because they are not convinced that the life of their fathers is a desirable goal. These youth yearn for meaningful achievement but they are dubious or ambivalent about the offerings and regulations of the school as appropriate means. A paper evaluating the experience in a philosophy

class included the following:

> I took philosophy to satisfy my curiosity. Like so many other kids, I walked in expecting to find a teacher who would present some philosophies, evaluate them, and have me attempt to duplicate these processes in tests. Then the teacher could reward me with an "A" which supposedly meant that I had learned something. All that is really great until one day you realize that you're a senior and you really don't know how to think!
>
> Enter Mr. _____! No tests. No lectures. Paradise. You can sit in an indiscriminate seat and carefully blend in with the walls while some of the most challenging ideas you've ever heard pass ten miles over your head. Suddenly you wake up one day and realize how much you've been cheating yourself out of. So you contribute an idea. And for the first time in your life the teacher does not check an outline to see if it's on the list. So you add another one. And a chain begins. For once you know your ideas are as good as anyone's, even the teacher's. Little by little you have learned to <u>think</u>, and it's a fantastic feeling 'cause now you know you are really a lover of wisdom.
>
> The best part of the class was realizing that I was not alone in this experience.

Home and community have given most of the suburban students a built-in drive toward achievement. Their problem is to find a role and meaning for their own lives, goals worth striving for, adequate challenge for their capacities. Here as in the inner city, there is questioning and rebellion regarding established values and patterns, though the action is much more reserved. In the fall of 1968, however, half the philosophy students at New Trier indicated that they had participated in the demonstrations related to the Democratic Convention.

The values suburban youth see in philosophy are very similar to those reported by inner city youth, namely, a better understanding of the meanings and purposes of their own lives, appreciation and sensitivity toward different persons and ideas, perspective on the relation of various aspects of education, more understanding of the balance between individual

freedom and social order, and new perspectives on the role of religion.

Factors in educational differences. Both the urban and suburban schools face financial crises, all traceable to general conditions but differing specifically. St. Mary's problems are those of a Catholic parochial school. Hyde Park High School is part of the Woodlawn Experiment and depends on both federal and city funds. The suburban schools were caught by surprise in a tax revolt which became severe in 1969 and 1970 and resulted in serious problems in each school with reference to the continuance of philosophy in 1971-72. It is a measure of the favorable impact of the High School Philosophy Project that nine out of ten schools created ways to maintain philosophy on their own budgets after project subsidies.

Experience in this variety of schools shows how much difference home and community cultural background makes in the philosophy classroom. In low income areas the parents have less education, the home has less reading matter, radio and TV are less apt to be turned to educational programs. Human concerns are similar in both places, but proportionate emphasis in affluent areas is stronger on aesthetic elements, on intellectual activities, on social graces, on conventional acceptances. To some extent, but not wholly, these cultural differences are also associated with racial and ethnic factors. The Black student in Evanston shares something with the cultural life of the Hyde Park ghetto, but academically he is more influenced by the suburban educational situation and his middle class economic status than by his color.

This is a rebellious generation in both city and suburb, but the urban student is a rebel along with his community, the suburban student against it.

Urban rebelliousness is more overt and active, more upsetting to school discipline, more controlling over the student concept of relevance. Suburban student rebelliousness is less acceptable to parents and teachers, less apt to be overt, perhaps more suppressed. Possibly it is significant that hard drugs are occasion for more concern in the suburbs than at Hyde Park or St. Mary. Drugs are used for escape in both cases, but in urban areas school authorities find alcohol a more immediate problem than marijuana or heroin. Alcohol is all the students can afford.

We have recognized student attitudes of personal independence and rebellion. It should be noted, however, that these attitudes not only differ between communities but are not at all uniform in any one place. Philosophy papers and class discussions often were revealing at this point. A small percentage of students, either in the ghetto or the affluent suburbs, were sweepingly negative toward the school, the establishment, home, and the American Dream. A large minority accepted all the contemporary framework, sometimes belligerently, and sought success in traditional ways. A majority, again in both slum and suburb, had deep questions about the structures, values, and operations of society. They indicated insecurity about their own future. However, most of these students expressed helplessness to change things or to guide the processes of change. They were apt to retreat within themselves or feign a pattern of partial conformity.

Philosophy appealed in special ways to each group, but among the "uneasy majority" there were some who found special values. Some students with exceptional intellectual ability found a challenge and stimulus they had

not had before and they performed amazing individual projects. There were papers which showed reading, sound analysis, and critical comments on works including Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason;* Heidegger's *Being and Time;* Tillich's *Love, Power and Justice;* Whitehead and Russell's *Principia Mathematica;* and others.

Of course these were exceptional students, but they also found exceptional stimulus and freedom for full use of their powers in philosophy classes. Another special group was the "professional non-performers." One teacher commented that these students hold a most interesting potential. They complained that school was a jail for busy work or irrelevant demands, that the teachers understood little of what was going on in the world. They had poor attendance records. About half of them, when released from routine requirements and given a little encouragement, prepared long diligently written studies. Topics often concerned some aspect of "the meaning of life" and used a wide range of materials. Others among the "non-performers" were less expansive, but even they did more work in philosophy than in most of their other classes. Thus it appears that some of the rebelling students performed much better with freedom, though a few simply "goofed off." The trick is to identify the best approach for each individual!

Suggestions for Further Research

The experience of the CSCA-Carnegie Project suggests several further experiments likely to be useful.

1. Just as this project demonstrated the feasibility and appropriate patterns of philosophy instruction in high schools at the extremes of the metropolitan spectrum, similar experiments would show the appropriate patterns for schools in "blue collar" middle and lower income areas and in rural areas.

2. Experience in the project indicates that a much wider range of students would benefit from philosophy courses. These would include the lower grades in high schools and students in lower academic achievement groupings. There would have to be modifications appropriate to such groups, and experiments would show what these should be.

Chapter V

COURSE AND UNIT PATTERNS

Experimental Freedom and Variations

Since the CSCA-Carnegie Project on High School Philosophy was a feasibility study, it was agreed from the beginning that a variety of approaches should be tested and evaluated. Therefore, each teacher was encouraged to devise his own course, adapting and revising it as seemed advisable. Each teacher remained very sensitive to student response and sought to dwell on points that aroused interest (such as existentialism) or points where student assumptions seemed philosophically questionable (such as sophistic subjectivism). Each teacher also pursued the broader objectives of the program and tried to develop such breadth of treatment that students would glimpse the range of philosophical interests and approaches. Constant discussion of classroom problems in staff meetings caused teachers to borrow readings and procedures from one another, but also stimulated each to work out new solutions for common problems. Each teacher tended to develop a basic approach and structure, but to modify this with each repetition.

Although the current trend in high school curriculum seems to be toward flexibility, there remains general administrative concern that courses should be fully pre-planned and material established. Some school boards insist that texts or books of readings be approved before they are used. Teachers in this project came to resist the notion of rigid syllabi or texts to be followed closely through a schedule of assignments. The potential conflicts between the philosophy project and established

procedures were avoided through very full acceptance by the schools of the experimental nature of this project. Furthermore, no standardized texts or syllabi are now available in high school philosophy.

In approaching philosophy as a living process to be followed rather than as content to be covered, teachers noted a typical sequence of student response. When the class was introduced to student-centered, open, and free response, there was a stage of skepticism and then a releasing sense of freedom. Students began to speak freely and seriously because their own concerns were taken seriously and pursued. The critical examination of student questions and comments led to growth in a sense of responsibility for their own statements and careful listening to others. As philosophical readings were introduced they added a wider context for continuing growth in self-knowledge, in rational approaches to problems, in sensitivity to ideas and feelings of other persons, and in clarity and organization of values.

Various Approaches to Course Patterns

The courses given as part of this experiment were offered simply as Philosophy, but the actual content showed several patterns and modifications. An effort has been made in what follows to classify the approaches, but this classification must be taken with great caution. The groupings are those of the compiler and not of the whole staff, and they are intended merely as a device to highlight some of the variations.

Classical. The "classical" approach centered on carefully pre-selected readings. Typically, students were given preliminary background and guidance for study of a given reading through short lectures and/or study

guides. They were asked to analyze the position of the author, examine the arguments used to support the position, note assumptions and implications. All this was discussed in class. The teacher helped to develop implications so as to show their relevance to concerns expressed by the students. Current news, articles, and local events were used in this process. Schedule was flexible, holding longer to matters evoking special interest.

There are several advantages to the "classical" approach. It gives a definite list of reading material for the school's review process. Assignments can be clear, yet adjusted as to pace for the particular class. It introduces students to significant parts of our heritage. It gives a straightforward basis for overt examination of philosophical methodology and goals. Perhaps this is the safest way for beginning teachers because preparation can be so clearly directed.

All the project staff used some pre-determined readings. In 1969-70 all agreed on some material that would be used, with the provision that schedule and context were to be decided by the individual teacher. Most of the local teachers who continue philosophy classes in the project schools will use a combination of this and the next following approach. Among the CSCA Project staff, Birmingham, Hollenbeck and Meyers are good examples.

In presenting each reading to the class, Mr. Hollenbeck said the students would be expected to: 1) follow the argument in each case, 2) be able to state the author's intent and concerns, 3) show the relevancy of the writing today, 4) answer whether the proposed solution is plausible for parallel problems today and, 5) examine the argument itself for validity

and usefulness. Some of his own comments follow:

> My reading assignments were short, emphasizing depth rather than quantity. We would often spend two weeks or more on a selection or, say, twenty pages. The student was encouraged to depend upon his own mental resources rather than things which could be reported out of some encyclopedia. In the term paper (5+ pages) the student was encouraged to pursue his own philosophical interest either by setting down his view of some problem or by analyzing another thinker's treatment of an issue. The quality was by no means uniform, yet the sparks of originality, self-disclosure, and ingenuity were impressive.

Issues. The "issues" approach was structured around topics, with readings chosen for their illumination of the problem more than for their inherent or classical contribution to philosophy. This approach was launched 1) by open discussion to determine the concerns of the class or 2) by the instructor's selection of topics based on prior experience and acquaintance with the students. If the instructor decided the topics or problems beforehand, he had to be open and flexible to changes indicated by actual response of a particular class. It was possible, however, to have a list of readings ready for official approval, to prepare himself on specific topics, and to collect current references so they were ready in advance of relevant occasions in class.

All classes in this project took note of specific topics which seemed to call for special attention, and tried to expand the discussion creatively at these points. Some teachers were more definite in announcing to the class the chosen topics at the start of the semester. These included W. Douglas Larson, Carolyn Sweers, and Hugo Thompson. Sister Dolores Dooley might be classified here because she participated in the Humanities course at Lake Forest where the topics for lectures were determined by the teaching team and announced at the beginning of the semester.

Mr. Larson structured his courses around five problems:

1) The self (psychological views)

2) Others (anthropological views)

3) The world (metaphysical systems)

4) Knowing (logic and epistemology)

5) Valuing (ethics and aesthetics)

He also tended to structure each week in a sequence of background lecture, discussion of readings, tests, and entirely open discussion on topics of student choice.

Mr. Thompson structured his course on problems related to the nature of man:

1) Man's quest for meaning

2) Man as part of the natural world: problems of freedom and determinism, mind and body

3) Man as thinker: validity of knowledge, role of reason in choice, communication, the ego-centric predicament

4) Man as social: human interdependence, problems of social structures

5) Man as valuing: relative and universal values, the role of rules

6) Ultimate questions: world hypotheses, the religious leap of faith.

Life Styles. "Life Style" approaches explored alternative life styles based on major philosophical positions. Each "weltanschauung" was explored through some literature of the position. The objective here was to prod the student into a fresh look at the implications of his present uncriticized life-style, to confront him with serious examination of positions radically different from one another and from views he had previously taken for granted. Thus the class became an exercise in sympathetic understanding of

new views, exposure to challenge, exercises in careful critique, and illustrations of significant grounds for life-choices.

Since the life-styles to be explored were pre-determined, readings could be listed and approved, the instructor could be specifically prepared, including possible individualized assignments. The approach was also flexible as to detail, schedule, and current illustrations or audio-visual material.

The members of the project team who used the "Life-Style" structure most consistently were Paul Bosley and James Otteson. Mr. Otteson used the life styles identified with the philosophical positions of Classical Idealism, Pragmatism, Analytic Philosophy, Existentialism, Psychology, Marxism, and Oriental Mysticism.

Mr. Bosley's more detailed account of how spring semester 1971 developed may be abbreviated as follows:

> The primary aim of the course was to encourage the students to develop their own philosophies of life by means of critical thinking about some fundamental questions of human existence. Specifically, these questions were: What is Man? How does he know? And what is the nature of ultimate reality? The students were introduced to alternative and often conflicting answers to these questions.
>
> The course itself was structured around four different sorts of philosophy: Plato's idealism, Sartre's atheistic existentialism, the philosophy of science and philosophy of religion. The topics were explored in varying detail, with the heavier emphasis falling upon the philosophy of science. The detail on some of these units is described below:
>
> 1. Introduction to Philosophy
>
> Texts: *Invitation to Philosophy*, Honer and Hunt (Wadsworth), Chapter 1
> *Learning to Philosophize*, E. R. Emmet (Pelican), Chapter 1

The students were introduced to some of the problems in the definition of philosophy, and some of the solutions which have been offered.

2. Plato's Idealism
   Text: *The Great Dialogues of Plato* (Mentor), *Republic* (parts of Books 6 and 7), *Apology, Crito,* and *Phaedo.*

The myth of the cave and the divided line theory became pegs on which to hang Plato's epistemology, metaphysics, axiology and theory of the good life.

We opened with a series of formal presentations on the nature of metaphysics and epistemology. Each student was required to read the chapter on epistemology (Chapter 5, Honer and Hunt), then select the theory of knowledge which he or she thought closest to his own. This was pursued in discussion groups. In turning to Plato's position, I focused initially upon the philosophy of mind in ancient Greece. In this connection I. M. Crombie's *An Examination of Plato's Doctrines,* Volume II, Chapter 7, proved helpful. I used a series of overhead projector drawings to illustrate Plato's metaphysics, epistemology and theory of mind, and the ways in which they are interdependent.

3. Sartre's Atheistic Existentialism
   Texts: *No Exit* (Vintage), from which we read "The Flies" and "No Exit."
   Film: "No Exit" (Film Center, Inc., 20 East Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611. $47.30)

I gave a series of presentations on the history of existentialism, focusing upon the contributions of Kierkegaard and Nietzsche. Special attention was given to the problems of subjectivity--perhaps THE problem which must be confronted in the high school philosophy class, since most students seem to be operating with a rather "hairy and uncircumcized" subjectivism--, "bad faith," and the fundamental issue of freedom and responsibility.

When we turned to Sartre, the above materials were supplemented by two handouts:

"Existentialism is a Humanism," by Sartre
"The Wall," by Sartre

The students were asked to write short papers on Sartre's insistence that "existence precedes essence." They were required to show how Sartre responded to either his Marxist or his Catholic critics (see "Existentialism is a Humanism"). There is a strong tendency among most students to operate with a definition of freedom which means, in effect, "do your own thing." Thus it became crucial to consider carefully Sartre's notions of "intersubjectivity" and the "burden of freedom." Since there was considerable enthusiasm for Sartre (which I have found to be the case in all three years of our experimentation), what occurred was a rather fascinating confrontation between the students' understanding of freedom and Sartre's demand to know why such "freedom" should not be regarded as "bad faith" since it (so often) entailed some sort of "cop out" from responsibility

for the solution of fundamental problems in society!

4. Philosophy of Science. Cf. the special unit report beginning on page 63 for a detailed description.

5. Philosophy of Religion
   Texts: "The Lost Dimension of Religion," Paul Tillich (*Saturday Evening Post*, June 14, 1958)
   Man's Search for Meaning, Viktor Frankl (Washington Square)
   Film: "Night and Fog," (Mass Media Ministries, 2116 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21218. $30.00)

In this unit we explored the meaning of the religious situation today, and attempted to get clear on the essential nature of a "religious question." Our focus fell upon Tillich's notion of depth and Frankl's idea of the will to meaning. I have not discovered any issue which generates greater interest than the question of religious belief. Consequently, this area uncovers a large range of interests spanning everything from theistic existentialism and Zen Buddhism to the satanic church. Our efforts were directed primarily at understanding the existentialist foundations of Tillich's proposal and the psychological basis for Frankl's theory. Students were required to compare and contrast the viewpoints of Tillich and Sartre, and also of Frankl and Sartre and Frankl and Freud.

Open Process. The "Open Process" approach sought to develop altogether inductively, letting topics and readings be determined by the students either from their own suggestions or from their choice of material suggested by the instructor. No teacher followed this ideal unswervingly, but the emphasis here was on great flexibility and responsiveness. The instructor necessarily had to be prepared to follow a wide range of possibilities, so this approach probably was the most demanding of all upon him. There was always danger that the class would become simply a rambling discussion or that students would look upon it as such. The advantage was very exciting interaction and creative response between students and teacher. The approach created an atmosphere for new insights through penetrating analysis of philosophical alternatives and literature.

The team members whose work was most like this pattern were James Parejko and Caleb Wolfe. Mr. Parejko reported that the questions which got most attention were: Are men free? What do we mean by "good"? What is the best of possible lives? What is the meaning of life? Should I protest? What are the limits of knowledge? Is there a God? What is true rather than fallacious?

Mr. Wolfe's classes discussed the nature of love; logic and reasoning; "systems" and systematic thinking; mind, body and computers, physical and psychological determinism; "free will" in relation to Sartre, to goal setting, to interdependence; and society, its nature and demands.

Mr. Wolfe had these comments in describing his approach:

> Basic philosophical questions are raised in many courses. The demands of getting through a curriculum schedule preclude thorough facing of these questions by most teachers. The advantage of philosophy in high school looms here because its content is secondary to the persistent pursuit of questions students ask. Why is the process of asking and answering questions more fundamental in high school philosophy than content? We give three reasons:
>
> First, there is much more content than we can possibly communicate in one course. We need to give students the interests and skills to pursue additional content.
>
> Second, the process of philosophizing constitutes a better way of life. We want students to experience and adopt this way of life. The process is critical here, not the content.
>
> Third, we may believe that the student should cultivate his own thought processes and develop his own content. Has he acquired from society or his culture the powers adequate to this development? Is it not rather the case that the creative, directive capacities unique to himself still lie dormant within and need to be fostered?
>
> The students carry their content with them. The books of the great philosophers are merely supplements. Process is more important than content in philosophy class because through this process the students work out in the class the content which is already within them.

Others. Correspondence evoked by this project revealed many experiments with philosophy in high school. For example, Dr. Fay H. Sawyier of the Philosophy Department, Illinois Institute of Technology, has conducted discussions on "Philosophy and Science" at two inner city high schools in Chicago. These have been non-credit informal discussions meeting at seven-thirty in the morning on an entirely voluntary basis and have been so popular that they have continued for several semesters. In spite of the non-credit informality, students have done solid reading and have prepared short papers for discussion.

Dr. Willis Moore of Southern Illinois University taught a course in ethics at the University High School for eight years, and some of his students taught high school philosophy in nearby communities. The Reverend Roman Mueller, S.D.S., of Galt, California, prepared a very full outline for a Catholic high school philosophy course dealing with man the thinker, man in the world, man as man, man as religious, the ethical part of man, and personal alternatives. Jr. James Driver and Mr. Ronald Hertlein, in a Lilly Foundation project, prepared charts, slides, and readings for a study of "value inquiry for high schools."

Variety of Approaches. It is clear that the same general objectives for philosophy courses may be served by a variety of course patterns. Probably the best pattern and the best reading material is that which most arouses the enthusiasm of the instructor. Some instructors were enthusiastic about Aristotle and so were their students, while others found him difficult and uninspiring and so did their students.

The temptation of the teacher when first planning a high school philosophy

course is to attempt to cover too much content. Mr. Wolfe's comments above are pertinent here. Whatever the content of readings, the process is what has deepest impact on the students. But it is also true that solid philosophical readings are essential to avoid superficiality. Mr. Bosley and others commented strongly on this point in staff meetings.

The various approaches certainly are not mutually exclusive and they can be distinguished only with some artificiality. All must be combined in practice, though differences appear in emphasis. The variations here reported do suggest the possibility of several philosophy courses in sequence. The first course would emphasize process and explore student concerns to get the stance of philosophical inquiry. Later courses could deal in more depth with particular issues or readings. Students at Oak Park River Forest High School requested a follow-up course after one semester of philosophy in 1970-71. Mr. Hollenbeck agreed to meet a non-credit seminar on Tuesday evenings. They studied Bertrand Russell's *Problems of Philosophy* and Plato's *Republic*. Students expressed great appreciation.

Sections and Units

It will be noted in the course outlines reported above that several topics, questions, and sections reappear in courses by different teachers. Many of these are at least partially separable units, although the actual development of a topic would be greatly influenced by what went before and after it in a course. The unit character of these parts led the staff to much discussion about possible uses of carefully developed units, for which leading questions, specific readings, study suggestions and discussion hints could be prepared. Several such units could be combined as the instructor and class might choose to constitute the main body of the course.

Individual units might be used by teachers in other high school subjects as they appeared relevant. This might help give philosophical accuracy and depth to such discussions in other courses.

An example of such a unit is given in somewhat abbreviated form below. It is not assumed that this is a perfect paradigm unit, but it does illustrate what was done in the CSCA-Carnegie Project.

PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

Experimental Unit of Study by Paul S. Bosley

Objectives. Two objectives governed this unit of study. First, the student was introduced to some of the basic attitudes and methods of science. Secondly, each student was asked to apply the rules of scientific method to a diverse sample of specific subjects, where it was necessary to separate science from non-science. In pursuing these objectives, I was especially interested to discover how fully the students could understand that combination of particular observation and imaginative generalization which stands at the heart of scientific inquiry.

Outline of Subject Matter and Materials.

1. Introduction: Initially, the students were asked to draw upon their own backgrounds in science in order to evaluate a story that I read in class.

   a. The story, entitled "Seeing Without Eyes: An Interview With Reverend Ronald Coyne" (in *Attitudes of Science*, D. L. Whaley and S. L. Surratt, Kalamazoc: Western Michigan University, 1968), provided a graphic example against which to measure one's scientific attitudes.

   b. In small discussion groups the following day, the students discussed the story. They were given a set of discussion questions. In this discussion a wide range of attitudes emerged in a vigorous exchange of views.

2. The next class meeting each student was given a handout entitled "Four Attitudes of Science." The attitudes of empiricism, determinism, parsimony and scientific manipulation were introduced in reviewing this handout.

3. In the next few class meetings, the students were asked to apply the four criteria to a series of brief stories (some dealing with the miraculous--*Attitudes of Science*

contains some provocative materials--and one dealing with the Chinese practice of acupuncture based upon a *New York Times* article on the subject (Sunday, May 2, 1971, Section E, p. 7). In each case the student was asked to identify the specific violation of scientific attitude involved and to describe how it violated this attitude.

4. The following week I presented a lecture on Ernest Nagel's discussion of the difference between science and common sense (based on his book, *The Structure of Science,* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961, Chapter 1: "Introduction: Science and Common Sense"). Emphasized here were some of the ordinary uses of the word "scientific" and a general class discussion of Nagel's example, "Water solidifies when it is sufficiently cooled." This stimulated discussion of the key words, "water" and "sufficiently."

5. The students were given a handout entitled, "The Tenets of Naturalism." Based on Arthur Danto's article, "Naturalism" (in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy,* edited by Paul Edwards, Volume 5), this handout focuses upon eight basic beliefs of naturalism.

6. Discussion groups were responsible for studying this handout. I assisted in drawing out some of the implications for philosophy of science.

7. During the final part of this unit, we turned to a study of science as an adventure of the human spirit. In this section I was concerned to describe the combination of particular observation and imaginative generalization.

   a. Each student received a handout entitled "Science as an Adventure of the Human Spirit." This handout contained quotations from the works of Whitehead, Brownowski, and Warren Weaver describing the role of imagination and creativity in scientific inquiry.

   b. In the next class meeting the students were asked to apply the quotations--especially Whitehead's analogy of the flight of an airplane--to concrete examples in contemporary science. Specifically, they were asked to distinguish between particular observation and imaginative generalization, and then to show their interrelationship.

   c. In a classroom exercise, I asked every student to take out a sheet of paper, divide it vertically into two equal sections, and label one side Particular Observations and the other Imaginative Generalizations. Then I asked them to listen carefully to a scientist describing his research and to jot down under appropriate columns statements which they felt exemplified the two categories. I read aloud Chapter I of Loren Eiseley's *The Immense Journey* (New York: Vintage Books, 1957) entitled "The Slit." In this graphic

account of a paleontologist's explorations, there were numerous illustrations of both dimensions of scientific inquiry. The discussions which followed (where students compared their notes) were among the best in the entire course.

d. We concluded this section and the Philosophy of Science unit with a film and a take-home examination. We viewed an excellent documentary film, "Dr. Leakey and the Dawn of Man," and I distributed the exam just prior to its showing. The test included an extra credit question asking the student whether he or she agreed with the statement, "Science is essentially an artistic enterprise." The student had to justify his answer by providing a reasoned argument on its behalf.

Recommendations.

1. It appears that the high points in this unit insofar as student interest was concerned were discussions of specific stories. The most stimulating materials were those which provided the most concrete and graphic descriptions of living issues in the philosophy of science. Theoretical considerations came alive at the point at which they emerged from specific examples.

2. It would be preferable to narrow down the materials on Naturalism and to go into greater depth of analysis on some points. One could use profitably Titus' *Living Issues in Philosophy* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1970), Chapter XIII, "Some Forms of Naturalism," as excellent supplementary material for this section.

3. This type of unit has several potential uses:

   a. It could be incorporated readily into existing science courses.

   b. It could be expanded into a major section of a philosophy course.

   c. The crucial issues raised at a number of points could be stated with sufficient clarity that they could and, I think, should be incorporated into freshman level studies. The distinction between common sense and science, the idea of natural causes, and the role of imagination in scientific inquiry--these and other issues would be exciting and relevant to this age group.

Further Possibilities

The variety of courses tried in the CSCA-Carnegie Project suggests even further variations. Several high schools have suggested a course for

freshmen and sophomores. Others are discussing special philosophy courses intended specifically for non-college-bound students or for those rated below the median in academic ability classifications. Student evaluations have strongly urged that more than one course in philosophy be available. Project experience suggests ample materials for second or even third courses, but careful experimentation would be helpful. Of course there is the problem of competition for students in a crowded curriculum. This in turn raised questions of the basic needs for philosophy in high school.

As the project developed, teachers were invited to give "visiting lectures" in many other classes, such as history, English, Latin, social studies, and science. These led to conversations with fellow faculty members and to a brief questionnaire seeking more definite information as to ways in which philosophical questions penetrate a variety of courses. This study showed a very wide range of references to philosophical and semiphilosophical writings and writers. There were requests for units or consultations or visiting lecturers to help these teachers through unfamiliar or treacherous waters. Most of these requests referred to logic, scientific methodology, ethical concerns, or religious implications. Some teachers were concerned about the nature of knowledge and the prevailing student skeptical subjectivism.

Conferences with fellow faculty showed many possibilities of mutual aid. The philosopher could help others with lectures or study units on philosophical questions arising in these other classes. Similarly, other teachers could give background lectures to the philosophy class or clarify references by philosophy students to material in other courses.

Only one school in the Chicago Project used philosophy in an interdisciplinary course, namely the Humanities course at Lake Forest. However, a number of conferences were held with teachers and administrators in other schools where there are such courses, notably in Minnesota. Many educators are convinced of the need for interdisciplinary and integrated approaches to educational problems. At present, the term "Humanities" is used for a very wide diversity of courses. Sometimes it is taught by one person, sometimes by two, or five. Very often a team-taught interdisciplinary course tends to become an unintegrated composite of several parallel courses. There will be a series of lectures rotating among representatives of such fields as literature, history, social studies, and the fine arts. Too often this does not really help the student see the unity of these fields or ideas. Philosophy could play a helpful integrative role by showing how certain basic ideas and assumptions hold a culture together. A broadly trained philosopher could also be helpful in meetings of the Humanities Team where interrelations of all the material would be discussed.

Experimentation in other directions will occur to philosophy teachers and to curriculum coordinators as philosophy becomes fully accepted in high schools. Suggestions will be made later as to ways of fruitful experimentation.

Chapter VI

TEACHING MATERIALS

How Our Bibliographies Grew

The First Bibliographies. The first selection committee asked applicants to the Project to suggest texts and auxiliary materials they would use in the course. Those chosen to participate proved less likely to push private hobbies than to discover whether or not colleagues in the project had suggestions. Preliminary bibliographies therefore became rather compelling, especially when they coincided. Here are some of the books first used:

Bronowski: *Science and Human Value*
Carmichael and Hamilton: *Black Power*
Commins and Linscott: *Man and Man; Man and Spirit*
Fletcher: *Situation Ethics*
Frankl: *Man's Search for Meaning*
Fromm: *The Sane Society*
Girvetz: *Moral Issues*
Honer and Hunt: *Invitation to Philosophy*
Kaufmann: *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre*
Malcolm X: *Autobiography*
Plato: *Apology, Crito, Phaedo,* and part of *The Republic*
Popkin and Stroll: *Philosophy Made Simple*
Rapport and Wright: *Anthropology*
Robinson: *Honest to God*
Russell: *Problems of Philosophy* and *History of Western Philosophy*

The Search and Share Process. By the second semester most staff members were using auxiliary readings, either as class handouts or as assigned library resources. Mr. Thompson listed a score of reference materials as did Mr. Bosley. Mr. Parejko provided the greatest freedom and supplied the longest bibliography. Mr. Larson depended very heavily on student use of the *Great Books,* with the *Syntopicon* a required tool. Mr. Bosley brought the greatest variety into the course with frequent handouts such as:

Barnes, Hazel, *Humanistic Existentialism,* excerpts on "The Flies"
Divoky, Diane, "Revolt in the High Schools: The Way It's Going To Be"
Frankel, Charles, "Is it Ever Right to Break the Law?"
Fromm, Erich, *Marx's Concept of Man,* an excerpt from the Preface
Hook, Sidney, "The War Against the Democratic Process," from *Atlantic Monthly*
Hutchins, Robert, "The Promise of Education"
Huxley, Aldous, "Where Do You Live?"
Mill, John S., *On Liberty,* an excerpt from Chapter 2
Niebuhr, Reinhold, *Moral Man and Immoral Society,* the Introduction
Sartre, Jean-Paul, "Dirty Hands," from *No Exit*
Tillich, Paul, "The Lost Dimension of Religion"

Mr. Thompson introduced a form for eliciting student reaction to class materials. It listed books, essays, records, films, and auxiliary lectures which made up the content of the course and asked for a check mark in one of four columns: Valuable, Difficult, Not Valuable, Comment. Staff members were moving toward agreement as to the need for some common readings, all the while decrying any closed canon which would shrivel the freedom to experiment. The problem is economic as well as pedagogical. Even affluent students cannot buy all the books in which desired essays are found. Inner city students, who are otherwise provided books, consider purchase of more than one, the text book, quite unreasonable. But there also was the strong consideration that however participants differed in method and course content they ought to be able to agree on a minimum list of usable philosophical literature.

Second Year. All teachers in the second year agreed to use the following classics:

Aristotle: *Ethics,* Books I and II, perhaps X
Descartes: something from *Meditations*
Dostoevsky to Sartre: something on existentialism
Plato: *Crito, Apology,* and the story of the cave from *The Republic*

In addition, the following were used by two or more teachers:

Frankl, V., *Man's Search for Meaning*
Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*
Fromm, *Marx's Concept of Man*
Hesse, *Siddartha*
Honer and Hunt, *Invitation to Philosophy*
Kaplan A., *The New World of Philosophy*
Kaufmann, *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre*
Malcolm X, *Autobiography*
Mill, J. S., *On Liberty*
Ruby, Lionel, *The Art of Making Sense*

Mr. Larson abandoned the anthologies of Commins and Linscott, preferring to work with assignments common to all students in an inner city high school. He adopted the primary list plus Kaufmann, but held on to Rapport and Wright's *Anthropology*. Mr. Hollenbeck resolutely maintained his previous schedule. Two teachers new to the project, Mrs. Meyers and Mr. Otteson, kept close to the basic bibliography, but Miss Sweers performed the prodigious task of organizing a course and finding and printing readings for every part of it. This included excerpts from Tillich, *Systematic Theology;* John Wild, *Existence and the World of Freedom;* Kenneth Boulding, *The Image;* Maurice Friedman, *To Deny Our Nothingness;* Karl Jaspers, *The Perennial Scope of Philosophy*; Carl Rogers, *Client-Centered Therapy*, Huston Smith, "The Revolution in Western Thought," *Saturday Evening Post*, August 26, 1961; L. W. Beck, *Philosophical Inquiry;* Harold Titus, *Living Issues in Philosophy;* Antony Flew, *Body, Mind and Death;* and others.

By the beginning of the second year staff members were pressing each other for concrete descriptions of how class materials were put to use. Mr. Hollenbeck devised a basic guide for doing this. It was slightly revised and then accepted by the staff as follows:

1. Work Author Title Publisher and Edition
2. Objectives of the teacher in using this work. (Priority = *)
   General

Particular i.
ii.
iii.

3. Procedures: How was this work used by teacher or students?
   Period of Study
   Assignments: Date Assigned Date Due
   i.
   ii.
   iii.
   Class Work: description--Teacher or Student-Centered--A/V aids

4. Evaluation
   a. By students
   b. By teachers (or student use and response)

5. Summary evaluation of the work and methods employed with regard to the intended objectives.

The guide took up one page and elicited tangible descriptions of how materials functioned in or out of class.

Third Year. By the third year still other shifts occurred. Mr. Bosley prescribed only four works: Honer and Hunt, Frankl, Plato, and Sartre. But he asked students to make up *their own booklists*, briefly annotated. He supplied them a bibliography of one hundred twenty titles under the following rubrics:

1. Philosophy and Psychology
2. Philosophy and Counter Culture
3. Philosophical Classics
4. Existentialism
5. Philosophy of Religion
6. Philosophy of Science
7. Philosophy and Revolution
8. Philosophy in America
9. Logic
10. Introductions to Philosophy
11. Eastern Philosophy

Mr. Bosley's comments illustrate a general feeling that there is no book which may as yet serve as a text. He said:

> It is increasingly apparent that the successful development of future high school philosophy programs will require development of better materials than now available. A possibility which

has some merit might be the development of a series of original and secondary materials modeled after the Bobbs-Merrill Reprint Series in Philosophy. Attractively produced and designed to fit all standard ring binders, such a series ought to provide materials in aesthetics, epistemology, ethics, logic, metaphysics, philosophy of science, philosophy of religion and political philosophy. Inclusion of relevant audio-visual references, bibliographies and cross-referencing to related areas and issues would be helpful. Regardless of how it is organized, it should have as its fundamental focus the inter-relationship between philosophy and what Pierce called "the vitally significant topics," i.e. the philosophies men live by.

Mr. Hollenbeck kept Descartes, Plato, Malcolm X, Kaufmann, and Aristotle but added two others as follows:

1. Irving Copi, *Introduction to Logic*. Selected in order to establish certain procedural rules for carrying on class discussion and inquiry. Assigned "Exercises" which were meant to aid the student in 1) analyzing an argument into its constitutive formal elements, 2) understanding the relation between problems of discovering what is unknown and of proving or demonstrating what is known, 3) identifying common kinds of Informal Fallacies. My general evaluation of the nature and timing of this section is that it was poor. Students found the identification of Informal Fallacies helpful and of immediate use in other classes, but generally could not analyze arguments nor did they seem any more aware of the nature of and the need for logic itself.

2. Viktor Frankl, *Man's Search for Meaning*. Short, easily read book which not only raises the question of how and why some men retain the will to live...but also serves as a pointed reminder that material and scientific progress have not served to make men more humane.

Miss Sweers required Frost, S.E., *Basic Teachings of the Great Philosophers;* Descartes, *Meditations* I, II, III; John Locke,*Human Understanding* (excerpts); Berkeley, *Principles of Human Knowledge* (selections); Aristotle, *Ethics* I, II, VIII; Plato, *Apology, Crito;* and large parts of her previous bibliography. She had this to say about a few of her assignments:

> *Nichomachean Ethics:* Book I, 1-5, 7-10. The selection on the voluntary and the involuntary along with the selection of Chisholm's article is extremely useful for getting students to distinguish between aspects of an act, consequences of an act, and motives for action....Part of the instruction for this unit was to have students take any minor event in the halls at school and develop a

> list of all the aspects of the act. (My paper on act individuals and act types helps here also.)
>
> Descartes' *Meditations,* Books I and II, are especially useful in teaching students how skillful analysis simplifies problems and enables one to construct systematic knowledge....can be used in connection with discussion of computers and the mind-body problem.
>
> Sellars, W., *Philosophy and the Scientific Image of Man*...excellent introduction to the nature of ontology...slow reading...and its successful use depends upon careful pre-reading preparation.
>
> Shapere, Dudley, *Newtonian Mechanics and Mechanical Explanation* ...used very effectively to raise philosophical questions left untouched by the physics department, namely the status of scientific laws.

Under the necessities of the situation at an inner city high school during the third year, Mr. Larson mimeographed a complete text with varying margins for separate paragraphs. Readings from Plato's *Apology* and Aristotle's *Ethics* were quoted exactly but *Crito* was a printing of last year's student translation into street slang. Sections of texts in psychology and sociology were abridged and rewritten. Frankl also was abridged. Even Descartes, Hobbes, Rousseau, and Berkeley were partly rewritten and abridged. Mr. Larson wrote his own section on logic and analysis.

Criteria of Selection and Evaluation. To open up the field of philosophy and to secure lively relevance in class, some associates bent strongly toward literature, others toward experience described by science, and others toward standard philosophical works. Every participant used the great statements of philosophical issues found in Plato, Aristotle, Hobbes, and Hume. From the lengthening list of readings it is clear how anxious teachers were to trap students' interest by something in contemporary style or of immediate newsworthiness. Frankl's *Man's Search*

for Meaning proved to be a dependable door to philosophical discussion.

A constant criterion was the indefinite "How hard?" Here it became emphatically clear how enthusiasm of the teacher was an important determiner of difficulty. Most of the staff members found Plato manageable on his own merits, but the most successful use required considerable explanatory help. On the other hand Russell, who seemed incomparably entertaining to one teacher, repelled the students of another. One staff member used Dostoevsky regularly "because it came close to their condition" but a colleague working in the same school the next year found that he spent interminable time explaining to the students that this was their condition. Mr. Birmingham faced the difficulty by admonishing his students who wished to explore Kant that they would have to do it line by line in class. They did.

The inimitable connection between a work and the style and fervor of its user is illuminated in the report of Mr. Bosley about his unit on Philosophy of Science, cited in pages 63-65.

Other Resources

Handouts. As already noted, half the teachers used auxiliary handouts, sometimes articles that only recently had caught their fancy, maybe a news clipping to sample modes for testing truth, often a brief excerpt from a classic. By the end of the experiment nearly all teachers had come to favor use of only short segments of any work rather than urging a class to plod on page after page.

Library. At the beginning of the project Mr. Larson structured his course around extravagant use of the library, but owing to different circumstances in another school he later called for no such outside work. On the contrary,

Mr. Bosley, Miss Sweers, and Mr. Wolfe came to expect far greater student initiative toward library resources. The collections which were put to the most use were the *Great Books* and the *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, although at least twenty other works of introduction to philosophy or history of philosophy were also supporting material.

Original Material. Toward the end of the project, teachers were writing more of their own materials. At first this took the form of introductions such as Mr. Otteson's compact, articulated, one-page explanations of major philosophers. In the first year, Dr. Thompson gave his students brief substantive essays on some topics, and by the second year Mrs. Meyers, Mr. Bosley, and Miss Sweers had bravely joined in. When the third year arrived Mr. Larson wrote or rewrote at least two thirds of the material his students used. Mr. Hollenbeck, Mr. Wolfe, and Mr. Larson showed their dissatisfaction with texts in logic by writing up units with short substantive essays for reading assignments.

Experts. A fourth kind of material was outside resource experts. Mr. Bosley used a dozen people in a variety of approaches, frequently hazarding community controversy. His conclusion was that such people are occasionally useful for a deliberate purpose, but that usually they merely intrude another lecture in a setting where, all project participants agree, lectures are of dubious utility. If a lecture is to be efficacious it must be part of a process in which a number of other materials and methods are associated.

Students. A substantive and material resource is students themselves. It is imperative to recognize that the dialectical method, the open

discussion classroom, and the avoidance of lectures are not merely pedagogical manipulations. Students are themselves informants. They are philosophers. A teacher ought to recognize this resource. When a student states a judgment about a statement found in a text, an elucidation by a teacher, a comment by a fellow student, the class is gaining content. It is perceiving the movement of philosophy. Students need to take very seriously the reflexive process of philosophy. Therefore Mr. Larson, for instance, made one-half of grades dependent on perception of what students were saying to each other.

Student Reports. Another more conventional approach is to use student reports on the basis of unique observation. "What do five different people on your block say philosophy is? Include at least one first grader." From answers to such questions a teacher and the rest of the class learns important contemporary thinking. A student becomes a material resource by doing a project under specified conditions other than writing a paper which is a rewrite or even a reflection of available reading material. For example, one student made his own structured survey of the confessed dreams of forty classmates and thus supported claims against Freud.

Apparatus. Finally we must note that apparatus itself is important even in philosophy. At least once a week Mr. Larson would cover the chalkboard with both expansionist and reductionist analysis of terms, all supplied by students thinking as imaginatively as they knew how. Mr. Wolfe would lay out diagrams to explicate a text section by section. Of course the most familiar resources other than books are audio-visual aids.

Trends in the Use of Material

Mr. Thompson observed a shift in the three years toward the solid material of standard philosophical classics, accompanied, however, by assignment of shorter selections and by greater stress on auxiliary explanatory material. Mr. Hollenbeck and Miss Sweers especially, but also Mr. Birmingham, who was in the project only one year, felt an increasing need for emphasis on epistemology, narrowing the scope of the course such that it would cover theory of knowledge and theory of value and no more. Mr. Hollenbeck, Mr. Larson, and Mr. Wolfe came to believe that much more attention must be given to logic and that this must be quite a different kind of attention than given in any current text book. The language of logic must be domesticated. Mr. Bosley, Mr. Wolfe, and Mr. Larson also gave increasing emphasis to the philosophy of science.

The major trend was toward an increasing variety of ways of manipulating materials. Staff members certainly came to agree that a teacher must use a variety of methods to bring materials to life in the experience of all kinds of students.

Audio-Visual Aids

Films. Teachers differed widely in their use of films and records. Some teachers had available far greater resources for obtaining films than others, and their enthusiasm therefore was under less constraint than that of others for whom scheduling both films and machines was difficult and money was unavailable for films not already on a school list. Mr. Bosley enjoyed using films such as the *Encyclopedia Britannica's* "Plato's Apology" and "Aristotle's Ethics."

All who used "Night and Fog" in connection with Frankl's *Man's Search for Meaning* and Sartre's *No Exit* found it impressive. Just as the staff came to use shorter excerpts from the great classics, it may be that experiments with brief audio-visual experiences of these classics might prove extraordinarily valuable.

Recordings. Recordings such as "Being Black in America" received repeated use. Some staff members also used material which may be considered oblique to the purposes of philosophy, such as folk music recordings. In France Mr. Larson observed skillful use of short recordings from several kinds of music interspersed with brief observations by two students making a report on aesthetics--both entertaining and mind-stirring.

Mr. Larson taped scores of discussions for future review and later discovered that Mr. John Wilson of the Farmington Trust, Oxford, England, had played back tapes to the discussants, taped their ensuing interchange, and repeated this process as many as eleven times! One cannot doubt Mr. Larson's assertion that there were remarkable shifts of position during this process.

Video Tapes. The potentialities of video tapes were explored during the third year of the project through the interest of David Hart, NBC's Chicago producer of public affairs programs, and Bob Hale, master of ceremonies on the "Memorandum" show telecast every morning by WMAQ-TV. A half-hour show was video-taped at Lyons Township High School to show what was happening in the Philosophy Project. First, Superintendent Reber was interviewed about the nature and purpose of the philosophy course, then Mr. Wolfe's class was taped at length. Finally, Dr. Thompson, Dr. Reber, and Mr. Wolfe reviewed class proceedings with Mr. Hale and discussed the

significance of high school philosophy.

The program was telecast at 8:30 AM Sunday January 31, 1971. The videotape has been used for various purposes since. Staff members were impressed with the potentialities of the technique, through closed-circuit operation, to enhance student grasp of the process of philosophizing. Even more, they saw great possibilities in the technique as an aid in teacher training.

Uses of Texts and Libraries

It would be evident to anyone who listened to the semi-monthly colloquies of the staff that project teachers differed vastly in the way they handled materials. One year a teacher provided about 3,000 pages of class text. For each topic students had the freedom to choose from among three to twenty selections. Students continually gave reports on their various assignments and in addition were expected to be conversant enough with an alternative reading to be able to make shrewd criticisms of another's report. In contrast, another teacher resolutely required students to plow right through readings assigned for all. Even more extreme was the experience of one teacher, and then his successor, that about the only way to get the material read at all was to have students read it aloud in class or sometimes under the duress of an instant open book test.

Although most staff members actually required the purchase of simple outline texts such as Honer and Hunt, none used these other than for reference. Also, all teachers assigned occasional outside reports and some long papers which called for digging into outside sources. Many such student projects were individual and therefore one might expect

reference to almost any book in a high school library. Some staff members used basic philosophical reference works to supplement class discussions.

Mr. Bosley found the *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Paul Edwards, ed.) very helpful for background and made supplementary assignments from it quite frequently. He had in mind providing students with a background for and clarification of text materials. Others found Urmson's *Concise Encyclopedia of Western Philosophy* more within the high school range. Mr. Larson in the first year required acquaintance with the *Syntopicon* of the *Great Books*, always supplying a long list of options for the way a student might use it. His aim was to give students a pattern of scholarly organization of basic philosophical concepts and also a feeling for the wide ramifications of a topic chosen for a special report.

In the middle of the second project year the staff began to address itself to a comprehensive list of readings for classroom use and reference. Strong disagreement arose over how such a list ought to be made. Various "trial lists" were prepared and discussed. One member had begun an exhaustive analysis of lists of philosophy books, culling annotations wherever they were to be found. Meanwhile all teachers were using their own ad hoc bibliographies, which reflected less a systematic analysis of the best than simply what the teacher had found interesting and potentially useful with his particular students in a class in a certain high school with whatever library resources existed before the advent of philosophy. Accordingly, what came out of the experiment was a very personalized bibliography of what staff members tried, sometimes with great personal success.

A list of Readings for High School Philosophy is given in Appendix C. It consists of material that was used successfully by two or more teachers in this project. It has no claim as a definitive bibliography. That is a task for the future.

Chapter VII

THE CLASSROOM

Special Problems

Analysis of Process. The staff of the CSCA-Carnegie High School Philosophy Project was under unusual pressure to examine critically what went on in the classroom. As college teachers being "re-tooled" for high school, staff members were very uncertain which elements of the college experience would fit into the new situation. Carolyn Sweers put it this way in a talk to New Trier High School teachers:

> I have learned to teach high school philosophy by teaching, out of my experience as a teacher, and out of reflection on myself as a learner. Because the Project was experimental, we who taught had to be experimental. There were no books on high school philosophy teaching. We had to create a course and a way of teaching it while engaged in the actual process.

Staff members were aware that they were being observed evaluatively by their own students, the school, and those interested in the Project. They knew also that the entire project would be evaluated basically on what went on in the philosophy classrooms. Hence each teacher observed very critically, sometimes with an element of bewilderment, what actually occurred in philosophy classes. Miss Sweers tells of feeling success, based on her own judgment of class progress and student comments of approval, but "about three-fourths of the way through this past semester I began to sense that for some reason the course wasn't going to 'come off,' and at the end of the semester I concluded it had not been successful. However, the student response was as enthusiastic as before." This led to new questions about how to tell when a course is a success.

Such experiences, noted by each of the teachers, led to a whole new (for us) set of interpretations as to essentials of the successful classroom in high school philosophy. The project staff does not assume to present new theories for all education. We speak only of high school philosophy and the lessons we have learned as teachers in this project.

Doing Philosophy. The really important thing about a classroom is not what the student takes away in his notebook but what he takes away in himself. All else is means to this end. What the student takes away is a combination of information plus attitudes plus skills. Information alone is not enough, scholarly competence is not enough, enjoyment is not enough. For this reason, project teachers concluded that the best approach was to "do philosophy" rather than simply present information about philosophers and philosophies. It was also clear that knowledge of the views of great philosophers and how they came to their views is an essential part of doing philosophy in the high school classroom.

The attitudes which philosophy seeks to develop are those of critical, rational appraisal of ideas. This is not to deny an essential role in understanding and judgment for human sensitivity and emotion. Interestingly, teachers in this project were drawn along with the students to affirmation of the Existentialist insistence on the importance of emotive aspects of human judgment. But there is a basic rational, critical element which marks all philosophers, not least the Existentialists.

Discussion in Depth. It is characteristic of philosophical method that questions are pursued in depth. Hence there was great concern in the project to get class discussion beyond the popular "rap session," which

touches lightly on many things, to a rigorous critical analysis of positions: of assumptions, alternatives, implications, and conclusions properly drawn. This, in turn, led to recognition of need for understanding logical structures of arguments, together with skill in noting fallacies and in following logical procedures. Choice becomes not a simple emotive reflex but the outcome of thorough examination of issues, possibilities, and reasons.

Students as well as teachers ascribed their enthusiasm for philosophy courses to the openness and depth of class discussions. Both students and teachers gained new insights into themselves, the social context, and the great issues of human life. Mr. James Otteson summarized it this way:

> As a result of this experience, I came to the conclusion that philosophy is ideally suited to what Carl Rogers calls "student-centered teaching." The problem facing any teacher is how to combine content ("what's out there") with the subjective, integrative growth process of the student, wherever he may be cognitively and emotionally ("where I am inside"). It seems necessary to make a fairly radical departure from the "conditional passive mode" of much of our educational system in order to produce actively independent thought. I have found this active response from students most frequently in those classes where they realized I was not going to rescue them from a foundering discussion by turning it into a lecture tutorial. It is the teacher's function to reflect the students' opinions back to them, draw comparisons between various students' views, and act as a resource person if the student wants the opinion of books and scholars.

Religious Questions. Based on student response to discussions of religious questions, the staff suggested that controversies over religion in public schools might be resolved by developing this aspect of high school philosophy. Religion and ethics were the two areas of most active and immediate interest to students. In a unit or a course on philosophy of religion there is serious discussion of questions like the nature and reality of God, guilt, death, immortality, faith, and the role of religion in human

life. The context is not confined to various Christian theories and it does not demand preferential commitment. Thus religion can be studied openly and seriously without propaganda or proselytism, yet students are helped as individual persons to find themselves with reference to religion. The same can be said in other areas such as ethics or politics.

Dialectic Discussion

Meanings of Dialectic. Philosophers use the term "dialectic" in different ways, and the project staff itself was not wholly satisfied with the label, but there did not seem to be a strongly preferred term. It may help to compare our intended meaning with other interpretations, such as those of Socrates, Hegel, and Kierkegaard, who all used the term but stipulated meanings differing from their predecessors.

The meaning intended here would be like that of Socrates if he is interpreted as saying that the role of the teacher is more that of a questioner or a prodder than a lecturer and that the questions are to stimulate creative thought rather than answer or stop the mood of inquiry. The goal is that the student become aware of his own capacities and use them better. It would be unlike a Socrates to ask questions so "loaded" or leading that the only possible answers would be a docile "yes, of course" or "no, indeed." If the Hegelian Dialectic means that interplay between apparently conflicting insights must go on until a new perspective is discovered which will do justice to each of the varying views, then we agree. But not if Hegel means that every suggestion must be met by an adversary opposite and that these two must be pressed through conflict into a smooth synthesis which incorporates all the truth and strength of the former points into a new idea structure with metaphysical status.

Like Kierkegaard we see an element of paradox unresolved in all "solutions," because it is important to retain the full strength, truth, and integrity of each or all of the previously conflicting views. But we disagree with Kierkegaard if he is interpreted as saying that the existence of differing insights and interpretations proves that there are no rational patterns in life or the world and all is ultimately absurd.

Dialectic as Interaction. The staff came to speak of dialectical discussion as the basic element in successful doing of philosophy in high school. By this it meant reflective interaction of persons and ideas in conversational communication. The first essential is that everyone, the teacher and each student, really learns to listen. Discussion is something more than politely waiting for the other to finish so you can tell what you think. It is listening for meanings behind the phrases, looking for the exact position being stated, watching how supporting arguments are constructed, feeling the full force of the commitment or question. Another essential is a mood of mutuality, a sense of sharing, a common effort to discover satisfying answers to questions or solutions to problems.

Beyond these essentials there are several interdependent elements, all equally essential to the full dialectic--the questions and comments of the students, the readings, the participation of the teacher, and the papers or projects prepared out of class and brought into the exchange. As Mr. Otteson suggests in the quotation above, the teacher does have an essential role, but it is that of participant rather than dictator. Student views are essential to forward movement of the discussion, whether the naive and spontaneous outburst in the midst of class conversation or the more carefully prepared report or project. Depth is brought into the

discussion by all these, but most often by reading done out of class. Selections from great thinkers give new insights, alternatives, arguments, perspective, depth. They become models to emulate even while they offer suggestions to criticize.

Comparison with Other Forms. The word "discussion" is used with reference to a wide variety of conversational interaction forms, and staff discussion rejected some familiar meanings. A *forum* is not dialectic discussion, although when many teachers say, "We had a good discussion today," they often mean this type. In a forum the audience asks questions of the man on the platform. The questioning may be brisk and penetrating, it may help to draw out very important points or implications, it may arouse great interest, but there is no assumption that the speaker really learns new ideas or that the audience shares in a process of developing new ideas. In dialectic discussion the teacher has a role different in some respects from that of the student, but in the sharing and developing of ideas all are equal.

A *debate* is not a discussion. What is being called "the adversary process" is familiar in courts, in politics, and in debate teams. Two sides are each well presented in a contest setting, and at the end some audience (jury, judges, voters) decides the victor. It is a highly artificial, often closely regulated, form of exchange of ideas. Dialectic discussion assumes there are many more than two sides or aspects of most problems, and all the alternatives should be freely explored. The debate form is simplistic even though the arguments may be very complex and subtle. Discussion seeks solutions, not victories.

Dialectic discussion is not a *sensitivity training* program. Both involve interpersonal disclosure, sometimes in depth. But while dialectic discussion holds it very important to be sensitive to both ideas and feelings of others, its primary purpose is the rational critical examination of ideas. Thus, while there is no discrimination of persons, it is very necessary to discriminate among ideas; all should be entertained but not all accepted.

Necessary Elements. The necessary elements of dialectic discussion as a process of doing philosophy include at least the following:

1. All participants are viewed as involved in a creative, interdependent interaction process. Hence the necessity of respectful listening and the mood of mutuality. Through the sharing of ideas comes mutual understanding and enrichment.

2. All are open to ideas from whatever source. An enemy or "bad" person may have some good (valid) ideas. Students, teachers and authors are all entitled to have their views honestly entertained and criticized.

3. Issues are not oversimplified. Examination of many alternatives and aspects of a problem will illuminate meanings and lead to better solutions. If a problem is truly insoluble, examination will show why this is the case and how to live with the problem.

4. In the context of these basic understandings there is a place for the forum pattern in pursuit of implications of a presentation, a debate between two or more members of the group over some specific point, development of sensitivity to deeper levels of communication, but the impact of each of these methods is modified by inclusion in dialectic discussion.

The Context of Class Discussion

Student Experience. Project teachers commented that what the teacher is able to do in any classroom depends on what the students bring to the classroom. Discussion must begin within the realm of the students' experience. The starting point at Hyde Park and at Highland Park would be very

different, though both might later come to see or accept the same philosophical concept. The task of the philosophy class is to help students grow beyond the confines of their own previous interpretations of life and the world and to see the significance of new ideas. In this process, students often re-invent some classical philosophical position in their own search for new answers, but they do not see the full implications of these positions. A teacher can assist by pointing to historical parallels and to critiques of those positions and alternatives.

For this reason, it is observable that not only do individuals differ in first grasp depending on home background, but each entire school and community will have special points of insight and blindness. Hence the usefulness of various devices for discovering present opinions or awareness of problems. Mr. Larson and Mr. McCullough found such devices especially helpful in Hyde Park in an all-Black constituency. It also becomes necessary not only to select readings and reference material appropriate to each socio-cultural context, but to develop study suggestions in somewhat different ways. Two communities might both use the *Nichomachean Ethics*, for instance, but have very different discussions about it.

Readings. Paul Bosley commented at one staff meeting that when he began the course with a series of open discussions it was hard to get back to rigorous examination of reading material as a source of ideas. He noted a tendency to confuse informal discussion with lack of rigor. Therefore, he suggested, it is better to introduce readings rather quickly into the "self-expression sessions" to tie these things together and make students conscious of the relation between readings and discussions. His point was echoed by others, even those whose general style of teaching was

decidedly that of "Open Process" (See Chapter V). The discussion is superficial without conceptual framework and foundations. Readings are one way of providing these.

Lectures. Carolyn Sweers suggested once that "there is nothing usually done by lectures which cannot be done better in some other way." Michael Bennett reported a general trend at Evanston Township High School away from lecture to discussion, based on a general faculty judgment that "the most unsuccessful procedure at almost every level in almost every course is the lecture method."

Others were not inclined to dismiss the lecture so completely. Paul Bosley commented on some problems in dealing with the "myth of the cave" from Plato's *Republic*, and suggested "the reason some students were turned off by this segment of the course was my failure to provide sufficient relevant historical and philosophical background. Such background is crucial for the question of relevance to be treated adequately, and it can be given most effectively by a combination of readings (in this case some good history of philosophy) and lectures." The teacher's own lecture may be the clearest bridge to relevancy that the class can understand.

Background for readings or topics and summaries of discussions or problems seem to be the most frequent legitimate uses of lectures. They can also help explore assumptions and implications of a position when these lie beyond the experience of the class. Lectures or brief comments well done will stimulate student recognition of relevance. Many ideas of real interest to students are not recognized because they come in an unfamiliar language context.

On the other hand, all the project teachers were agreed on certain warnings. Lectures must be short. Exposition serves best when intimately part of a discussion. It is important to focus on student interest rather than on the "content to be covered," and on student interests rather than what interests the teacher, though if the teacher is not interested the students will not be.

Student Projects. All teachers in the project found both one-page and longer student papers very useful aids and supplements to discussion. Other individual projects were also used -- collages of pictures, selected recordings from a recent Rock Opera, an amateur movie by a group in the class. The short assignment was used as a way to stimulate careful reading, as a device for getting students to organize their own thoughts carefully, as a basis for class discussion. Longer papers or other projects were ways of helping the individual work out his own problems. When given with freedom, these opportunities were appreciated by students, and results were sometimes both original and surprising.

Tests as Teaching Devices

Since this was an experimental project allowed more freedom than usual by the school authorities, the philosophy classes received more than usual student pressure against tests and grades. A little of this rebellion arose from fear of spoiling good academic records because of unfamiliarity with the subject. More of it came from the students' subjectivist outlook: "How can you grade our opinions?" Project teachers also had serious doubts about grades in this case. They felt that grades are artificial incentives, memory tests are often meaningless regurgitation, and essay tests are very hard to grade objectively, consistently,

and fairly. One result was to get permission for "pass-fail" options in many schools instead of conventional letter grades.

Tests had defenders also. They do help the teacher evaluate the points of his own success or failure in the classroom as well as the progress and problems of individuals. They have important diagnostic value in relation to individualization of assignments and in counseling individuals. And, of course, teachers must make reports!

Can tests be made creative and educational exercises? One way used with notable success was to make tests, especially finals, oral and individual. The teacher could probe points of competence and discover weaknesses so as to combine a bit of help and counsel. Written essay questions could be asked so as to stimulate fresh looks at known material and applications to new cases. Students of memory suggest that occasional review increases retention. Examinations can have the function of stimulating such review and also of helping the student put a number of separate class experiences into coherent order.

The aftermath of a test can be made both interesting and educationally useful. Consultations with each student over corrected papers can get to specific points of difficulty. Charles Hollenbeck created a short essay out of a mixture of accurate and inaccurate statements from student test papers and brought this composite before the class for discussion. The total discussion was an excellent review of the material.

Not only the student but the teacher, and not only the individual teacher but the whole project in high school philosophy was tested by each class examination. More will be said of that in Chapter IX.

The Possible and the Inadvisable

What was done in this particular project does not prove what others could or could not do in high school classrooms. Correspondence indicates that various teachers across the continent are successfully doing things rather different from what seemed most feasible to this staff. But among the teachers in this project there developed general broad agreement.

The Inadvisable. Project teachers are sure it is not possible to hold student interest or have them learn much from a straight lecture course. Students would consider a purely historical or purely systematic course irrelevant, boring, and over their heads. They would soon leave a course engaged in technical analysis. It is not advisable to give high school students some slightly modified college or university course in philosophy. High school philosophy must be different from typical university courses in the field.

The Possible. What can be done in high school is to engage a group of students in philosophical activity, i.e., the examination of life, at significant depth. It is possible for students to see philosophical implications of familiar questions. It is possible for many of them (not just a tiny few) to read substantial philosophical writings with understanding if given appropriate aid, and to use ideas from such writings as part of their own thinking. It is possible for individuals and groups of high school students to engage in rational critical analysis, in some depth, of significant human problems. It is possible to arouse the interest of students and for them to take deep satisfaction in such studies. It is possible for students to be helped through philosophy classes to discover why and how to adopt a more rational stance

toward life, their own and that of society.

For these possibilities to be realized, it takes more than classrooms and libraries. It takes teachers with special attitudes and skills. That is another chapter.

Chapter VIII

THE TEACHER

Roles of the Teacher

In a dialectic educational process, the role of the teacher is no less important than in a lecture classroom, but it is more difficult. Most high school teachers will not have learned the techniques involved from the example of their own college and university instructors. The experience of the staff in the Chicago High School Philosophy Project does not necessarily provide a paradigm case, but it is reported here as an example of some success.

Participant in Dialectic Discussion. In the three-way interaction involving student, teacher, and readings, the teacher must lead the discussion, but with a light hand. He is more a "coordinator" than a "director," more a participating guide in a search party than the captain of a ship. Teachers in this program found it important to get out from behind a desk and sit in the circle with the class. The teacher usually introduces a topic and launches the discussion with a question that is not too difficult to answer, yet requires thought. The group soon learns to "take it from there," and the teacher then needs to hold discussion to the point, suggest alternatives, and call for prepared reports at appropriate times. Early in the course it is well to clarify what philosophical discussion is and why abiding by elementary rules of logic is better than merely giving opinions. Note the comments in Chapter VII about the inadequacy of wholly free and rambling talk, and the need to hold the group to rigorous and orderly examination of topics. The role of the

teacher early in the semester is apt to include encouragement of discussion. Later, as the group frees itself, the teacher can move into the background.

A very perceptive and self-critical teacher, John Birmingham, commented on his problems early in the course as follows:

> I began by trying to tell the students what I thought philosophy was. This was a mistake. I should have begun by asking them what they thought philosophy was. The success of the course depends upon my understanding of what they expected. The teacher's first task is to help students articulate what they expect, what needs they expect philosophical understanding to satisfy. This is itself a philosophical task and need not be hurried. The teacher must assume some students will have expectations which the course cannot possibly deliver. There must be some sort of consensus about what they want to do and can do in the course. It would be well if those whose expectations are radically disappointed could drop the course at this point.

As the term progresses, similar warnings are appropriate: the teacher must not talk too much, he must not respond too often (or too well!) to arguments lest the students become reluctant about presenting ideas, he must not defend authors nor attack them too strenuously but let students work their way more slowly to evaluations. That is, each teacher must develop his own devices for keeping balance in the dual role of guide and participant.

Resources and Guide to Resources. The teacher must select books to be available at the book store; select supplementary handouts and audio-visual material; arrange for references to be available in the library; suggest books for library orders; be alert for illustrative materials; prepare bibliographies; and in general determine readings for the course. High schools are finding ways of making their libraries more useful, and the philosophy teacher can assist by offering suggested lists and by

encouraging students toward individual reports.

Beyond responsibility for making resources available at appropriate times, the teacher must be an available and dependable resource in himself. In the present state of available literature, the teacher will have to give necessary background at many points. Sometimes this will mean preparing his own short handouts, sometimes short lectures, sometimes study guides and questions.

Although individual students and authors should be allowed to explain themselves, the teacher must also put their statements within some framework of interpretation. Students will offer helpful illustrations and applications if encouraged, but the teacher will often need to help them see the full range of implications and applications for positions under review. The student's own problems, such as the draft, drugs, his sense of depersonalized educational institutions, do not always come to his mind in relation to the language and context of classical philosophical literature. News and magazine articles, TV documentaries, current movies, or audio-visual aids may help to bridge theoretical positions and personally felt concerns.

Counselor. Philosophy classes in high school are often seen by both students and teachers as having a therapeutic counseling role. The atmosphere of open and honest inquiry promotes self-confrontation. Issues of real concern to students can be considered with competent attention to the problems of values so often evaded elsewhere and in a way to show that individual thoughts and concerns are universally human. In a world of structured and impersonal processes, students need to learn to trust

that reason will not destroy the inner self of feeling and freedom.

Some students crave a firm structure about them and may be seriously threatened by being thrust into such a wide open situation. Here the teacher needs to supplement class with individual counseling. In some cases he will have to be sensitive to the need for referral to professionally competent counselors on the staff.

In several staff meetings the teachers discussed the somewhat unexpected ease and extent to which philosophy class became a kind of group counseling process. It was generally agreed that such results are legitimate in philosophy as they are in other classes under sensitive and skillful teachers. But the therapeutic results are associated values and not the central objective. Philosophy deals primarily with ideas rather than psychic states, but its therapeutic potential lies precisely in showing the close relationships between these.

Model. The philosophy teacher may not be the ideal personality worthy of emulation but in fact he will be imitated. It is important that the teacher have and demonstrate within himself those characteristics that high school philosophy seeks to develop in students. He must show the intellectual rigor and honesty in class and the scholarship out of class that are stated as objectives. A teacher who seeks to instruct on the nature and problems of knowledge and communication must himself present an example of open and empathic communication. One who seeks to stimulate students to persistent and creative thinking must himself be non-rigid, able and willing to push into new paths. One who seeks to move beyond emotive responses to rational dialogue must himself be free emotionally, not too defensive about

favorite ideas, able to present fairly and effectively a wide range of positions. One who seeks to equip students for critical examination of their naive value judgments must be psychologically and intellectually secure enough to accept critical challenge to his own values and engage in mutual search for honest and solid ground for valuations in a time of great changes. One who seeks engaged interaction in dialectic discussion must be a responsible participant.

Any teacher becomes something of a model. Because philosophy itself is so hard to define, philosophers, even more than others, teach more by what they are and do than by their words.

Faculty Member. The routine responsibilities even for teachers in an experimental project are those of other high schools. Project teachers participated in the activities of their school faculties as much as was possible on a half-time basis. These contacts opened the way to new uses of philosophy. Project teachers were invited as visiting lecturers into many other classes such as American history, world history, social studies, economics, American literature, world literature, Latin, French, Spanish, senior honors classes, and a humanities seminar. In each case the invitation came because the class wished to know more about some philosopher or philosophical position noted in the work of the class. Existentialism was a very popular theme, and the usual problem was to enlarge the views of the class as to its varieties, correct some interpretations, especially Sartre, and suggest new implications of the position. Project teachers thought these opportunities very rewarding.

Conversations associated with these faculty contacts revealed many

teachers aware of philosophical problems which arise normally in connection with these other fields. Project teachers concluded that sometimes there was a solid discussion of such matters, sometimes a very misleading discussion, and often the questions were evaded as "not part of the course." Concern at this point grew so great that Wolfe, Thompson, and Larson drew up detailed suggestions for a course to be given in colleges or universities and designed to help general high school teachers deal more accurately and helpfully with basic philosophical questions. This course will be given experimentally in 1971-72.

Another kind of inter-disciplinary association occurred in connection with Humanities courses. As indicated in Chapter V, the project teacher at Lake Forest was part of the team giving a Humanities course. At other schools project staff lectured in Humanities courses, consulted with the teachers, or assisted in planning such courses.

Styles and Methods of Teaching

Each teacher develops a style out of his own background and experience. When the project staff attempted to identify and classify the teaching styles used most or found most successful, they did not succeed. Nevertheless, the types of course patterns cited in Chapter V suggest differences. But teachers who used similar course patterns differed considerably in classroom style. Asked what they thought worked in the classroom and what did not, they offered observations that may be summarized as follows:

General Planning. Variety is necessary to interest. A cycle or rhythm of kinds of work--technical, highly personal, expository--helps keep things

alive. Especially, it seems difficult to concentrate on technical aspects of philosophy for much more than a week. When discussion on some topic has developed well, it becomes anti-climactic to return to that topic through later readings. Introduction of many variants or alternatives may become confusing; better stay with a few main points. Also, too great a contrast in alternatives may confuse more than stimulate. The students need help to see extreme views as related and not simply separate and isolated. It is important for the teacher to keep perspective on the whole progression of thought so as to guide toward fruitful directions which students might not see.

Class Size. It is hard to have dialectic discussion with more than 20 students. If school policy requires larger classes, the philosophy class could well be divided, with each half meeting on alternate days while the other half goes to the library on individualized projects.

Lectures. Short interpretive statements are inescapable and can be very helpful, but there was unanimous agreement that it is a mistake to use extensive lecture time to present material. Richard McCullough concluded, "The straight lecture was not an effective procedure. The totally disorganized free-for-all type of discussion was also ineffective."

Readings. Readings should be short and cogent. The project staff found no present collection of readings suitable as printed. Long selections, or attempts to assure scholarly balance and fullness in presentation of authors or schools, turn off the high school student. He profits much by careful selection which speaks directly to a point at issue.

The order in which readings are used may be very important. John

Birmingham reported: "After reading Camus and Ayer (*Language, Truth, and Logic)* some students felt that Aristotle and Descartes were anachronistic and even naive. They were aware that Camus and Ayer were criticizing the positions of the former philosophers. Thus they had examined the positions of Aristotle and Descartes before they confronted these men themselves and it detracted considerably from their interest. Although I tried to concentrate on novel aspects, many students seemed to feel we were going over old ground."

Technical Philosophical Material. When engaged with technical philosophical material such as logic, language analysis, meta-ethics, and the like, it became necessary to introduce variety. Attention could be sustained for about a week and then it was necessary to turn toward implications or examples that excited interest. The technical material became most meaningful when closely tied to relevant illustrations. It was also noted that attempts to be relevant by discussing current events failed (i.e. became superficial) unless there was a conceptual frame of reference to give wider significance to the event itself. The balance of theoretical and technical material with practical illustrations and bridges to relevance is a delicate but important balance.

Student Responsibility. If there was any "teaching style" characteristic of this project it was constant experimentation with ways of giving students responsible freedom in the classroom. Larson and McCullough tried various discussion starters: "A questionnaire followed by discussion of various responses served as an excellent introduction to a unit. We also used pre-tests (called ignorance tests), student reports, student-conducted interviews and surveys of the community, and simulations." John Birmingham

suggested: "If I were to do it over again I would plan less text material and leave the latter part of the course very flexible. The students would have a larger role in determining course structure and progress. Individual assignments would give each a role in articulating this structure. I would assign class presentations more than papers or tests, and I would schedule them beginning the first week so that students would not develop any habits of passivity. I would lecture, correct, redefine, and clarify less since too much of this activity by the teacher invites students to become intellectually dependent."

Each To His Own. It will be seen that the various teachers do not categorize easily as to style, and anyway the "best" style must be comfortable to the teacher. A first year teacher, Tom Kysilko, said: "I tried three classroom procedures. 1) Student-initiated discussion was sometimes successful, sometimes not. Students would look to me for approval or criticism. Frequently they did not get things going, presumably because they didn't know what I wanted. 2) Lectures. I hate doing them, but the students seemed to love them, perhaps because they were few and a departure from routine. 3) Teacher-initiated discussion was most successful. I initiated and generally directed these discussions, attending to what caught on. I attribute success to the fact that I find the method comfortable."

One general point is clear from the comments about teaching success. The methods long used in college philosophy classes will not do well in high school philosophy. Perhaps studies need to be made as to whether dialectic discussion might improve the college classroom.

Qualifications of a High School Philosophy Teacher

The nature of the CSCA-Carnegie Project made it necessary to ask about appropriate qualifications from the beginning. What would govern the selection of project teachers? Later, when high schools were asked to find persons who might step into the shoes of project teachers, the question of qualifications arose again. The project office prepared several statements about qualifications and submitted them to discussion by the staff, high school officers, and CSCA college philosophers. The resultant documents were used as suggestions to inquirers. They are the basis for the following comments.

Certification. Since regular high school teachers must be certified by the Department of Education in the state where employed, the project office made inquiries of all 50 states about certification requirements for high school philosophy. Only California listed philosophy as "normally certified" in 1969. All other states indicated that general requirements would be applied toward emergency certificates until a program of qualifications had been approved. The general requirements in all states are very similar and follow basic norms of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). In many cases, state approval for certification normally follows from recommendations of an NCATE-accredited college or university.

Colleges establishing teacher-preparation in high school philosophy must, of course, note state requirements. They must also solve several problems: 1) Specific descriptions of work to be required in philosophy. 2) Leadership for instruction in materials and methods for high school philosophy. The project staff strongly recommends that the instructor of

such a course should have had at least one year's experience teaching high school philosophy. 3) Supervised student teaching at schools offering high school philosophy. There now are at least ten schools in the Chicago area which could arrange student teaching and there are perhaps forty or fifty others scattered across the country.

Experience in the project suggests additional specific recommendations: Teacher preparation should include skills in leadership of dialectic discussion. The philosophy teacher should have at least a Master's degree in order to assure richness of subject background. And in the present early stages of high school philosophy teaching as a profession, the teacher should be qualified in a second subject also.

Philosophical Qualifications. The background required to make dialectic discussion educationally effective is that of a normal philosophy major in a good college plus some specialized work at a graduate level. It was the judgment of the project staff that the following elements are of primary importance for high school teachers:

1. A solid background in the History of Philosophy; that is, such familiarity with philosophers, issues, and schools, including various contemporary movements, that all this may be drawn upon easily when relevant.

2. Understanding of the major Problems and Fields characteristic of philosophy, including particularly epistemology, metaphysics, and ethics, such that major alternatives can be presented both systematically and by reference material.

3. Knowledge and skill in Philosophical Methodologies such as logic, analytical procedures, and scientific methods, such that students may be helped both to acquire these skills and to understand their uses and limits.

4. Grasp of Value Theory, not only as ordinarily associated with elementary courses in ethics and aesthetics, but also basic considerations about the nature of valuation and various appropriate ways of examining value statements.

5. Special competence in Existentialism, Ethics, and if possible, Philosophy of Religion.

Student Comments on Philosophy Teachers. In the spring of 1970 and again in 1971 the Project Director asked groups of students who had taken the course about their reactions to it. The group interview was tape-recorded and transcribed. Some questions elicited student evaluations of philosophy teaching. The following responses by many different students from different schools are typical.

Q: Do you think there are special requirements for a philosophy teacher that may be different from those for other teachers? Suppose you were going to select someone.

S: Make sure it isn't just some over-zealous English teacher who thinks he can hack it. You know--the person must be well prepared or the course will flop.

S: The teacher makes the course. It is really not enough to be trained in literature or something and then come over to philosophy. It takes special education in philosophy so one is really master of the subject.

S: Philosophy is kind of tricky. The teacher has to have a lot of background to sort out the arguments and keep discussion from wandering into something else.

S: She has to have her own set of philosophical values so she doesn't just go wavering. She should allow everyone to have a viewpoint without wavering herself. The teacher must not ride anybody, but let the discussion be free. She should guide but not exactly rule it.

S: Our teacher sometimes puzzled me. He questions everybody but does not give his own opinion. I guess he does that to make us do the thinking and not just take his answers.

S: I think the whole idea of the course is to question. The teacher in philosophy has to be a questioner. If he answers things right away a lot of kids would just say "Wow! that's the right answer!" It's the only course where you don't have simply right or wrong answers.

S: And a teacher must be tactful, because in a course like this I got so many hang-ups for awhile that I was considering running away from home or shooting myself--something weird like that. I mean he must know how to deal with material that might be shocking.

Q: What would it take to make the kind of teacher who could make the most of it?

S: I would not like to see a teacher who knows a lot but presents his own ideas as final and doesn't leave any room. Then you don't dare think for yourself. I think that would be the worst thing.

S: You have to develop a personal type of relation between the teacher and the student. Each person has his own set of ideas and you have to understand that person as an individual. That has a lot to do with opening things up. It's not like a math class where you just have to get facts down. Here you have to have information, but also you have to help each student form his own opinion.

S: You have to have structure for a class, but the whole class has to be taught a little bit the way you do independent studies and develop independence in the students.

S: Another thing really basic is not to have an ego hang-up. A lot of teachers here are really authoritarian because they have to show their authority. A thing about our teacher and a couple of others is that she knows where she stands, so she is not in danger of losing her confidence. So she does not have to assert her control over us.

S: Some courses can be taught by staying a jump ahead of the students in the textbook, but the philosophy teacher must have thorough knowledge of all philosophers so that when somebody brings something up she can point out that they are starting out on an idea that has been developed before, so she can suggest research for them.

S: One problem comes to me. How do you weed out bad teachers from good ones? Once a teacher has tenure it is pretty hard to get her out.

High School Philosophy as a Profession

Role and Requirements. Many inquiries came to the office of the CSCA-Carnegie Project asking about opportunities to teach philosophy in high school, the requirements, and the outlook for such work professionally. The Project Director therefore prepared a "Memo to Prospective Teachers of High School Philosophy" which was distributed at midwest meetings of the American Philosophical Association and to inquirers by mail. The

substance of that memo is expanded in this report. Questions as to what is involved in being a high school philosophy teacher have been covered in this chapter, insofar as this project can shed light on these matters. A few remaining considerations will be described below.

Employment Opportunities. A period of severe financial squeeze on education is a difficult time to introduce a new program. Correspondence seemed to indicate a readiness on the part of administrators to adopt philosophy in perhaps a hundred schools across the country. Some of these are finding ways to go ahead, but many are forced to wait for financial reasons. In the years 1971-72 and 1972-73 it is probable that introduction of philosophy programs will be slow. However, it is the conviction of teachers and high school administrators who have been associated with the CSCA-Carnegie Project that the values of philosophy will commend themselves to schools increasingly as many factors force re-examination of the objectives and processes of secondary education.

There will be few schools able to employ a full-time philosophy teacher in the near future. Out of the nine schools in the project which will have philosophy next year, one is employing a philosophy teacher full-time, two at four-fifths time, and the others two- or three-fifths time. This means that a teacher must be competent in some other field as well as philosophy.

The prospective high school philosophy teacher must remember that schedules are very full and allow little time for research or general background study except in summer time. A teacher must be prepared before he begins! This is doubly important because of the present lack of texts, syllabi or

teacher guides. Some college philosophy teachers in nearby institutions could be of great help regarding literature and other resources, but it must be remembered that classroom processes in high school philosophy are not typical of college courses or college teachers.

Professional Standards and Status. A resolution on high school philosophy was adopted by the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association on May 7, 1971, upon the initiative of members of the CSCA-Carnegie Project. It will be sent to the national level through the executive board of APA. The resolution welcomes high school philosophers into the Philosophical Association, calls attention to placement facilities available, and offers cooperation in the establishment and maintenance of high standards for this part of the profession. This recognition by the professional organization of philosophers is important to the status of high school philosophers.

Standards for high school philosophy may be expected to parallel those in other fields except that initial norms are being created at a time of generally elevated expectations. Philosophy is apt to be adopted first in schools which hold high qualifications for teachers. Some positions will be open to B.A. degree holders, but it is likely that a Master's degree will become normative, both for the sake of professional competence and for the sake of the teacher's security.

Chapter IX

EVALUATIONS

Approaches and Problems

Evaluation of the success or failure of high school philosophy classes was a continuing concern of the staff. The classes had to be evaluated, of course, in terms of their ability to achieve their objectives. Although initial project goals were clear and directional, they were very broad. Consequently, the statement of objectives developed by the staff in March 1969 (cited on pages 11-12), became the basis for evaluative procedures.

The schools and students were cooperative in most efforts at evaluation, but the problem of adequate instruments was somewhat puzzling. Expert counsel was sought and various instruments were devised and revised throughout the program. Many elicited student evaluations. Some consisted of reactions from project teachers who, after all, were in the most strategic position to see what was working and what was not. Their positive bias was at least partly balanced by mutual criticism and a sober sense of responsibility.

In order that evaluations would not depend entirely on the subjective judgments of project participants, some were made by external agencies. And since the judgments of high school administrators usually reflect extensive experience and often are crucially important to schools contemplating philosophy programs, they were gathered.

Student Responses

Enrollment. Requests for enrollment in a class are decisive indications of interest. It is significant, therefore, that from the beginning there were more requests for philosophy than could be accommodated. In the Highland Park-Deerfield system the situation was met by pressing a local faculty member to teach the overflow. Elsewhere, various limitations were imposed, such as enrolling seniors only instead of juniors and seniors. But in accordance with a project ground rule, enrollment was not limited to upper ability levels.

The following chart reports enrollment for the three years of the project, with the preliminary requests for 1971-72.

Enrollment Summary

	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72
Deerfield	75	185	190	200
Evanston	64	50	50	80
Highland Park	80	125	106	100
Hyde Park	49	58	25	80
Lake Forest		Inter-disciplinary program		
Lyons Township	80	51	80	110
New Trier East	46	60	85	60
New Trier West	33	60	60	60
Oak Park River Forest	64	70	73	75
St. Mary	36	22	13	25
Totals	527	681	682	790

Questionnnaire Results. Questionnaires were given students in class at the end of each semester to obtain their reactions to the course. The forms used in this process took several versions under different teachers. These versions were compared with similar student questionnaires from other sources and revised again until the latest version shown in Appendix A was produced and used in 1970-71. Since there were different

versions, the tabulation in Appendix A involves some translation of earlier results into the 1970-71 pattern. It should be noted also that the replies from one class or school differed from those of another, so that the summary in Appendix A represents over-all results.

The incomplete sentence items in the questionnaire elicited some points not fully revealed in the scaled items. For example, the purpose of the course as students understood it was described as follows:

> To inspire the kids to think deeply and rationally about philosophy and other stuff
>
> To introduce us to various ideas so that we can begin to form a philosophy of life
>
> To study various philosophical questions and opinions, study philosophical thought and proofs (method), and arrive at our own conclusions
>
> Gain an understanding of various philosophers to give us a better self-awareness
>
> More self-understanding and a start in the understanding of others.

The following illuminating comments were written as notes to the teacher at the end of the questionnaire or as explanations of answers to some questions:

> The importance of this questionnaire must be played down. It was written at one time and in one mood and at another time my answers might have been different.
>
> I hope you have learned that high school students are competent, self-aware entities who can competently deal with philosophical questions. This is the best course by far that I've had in high school.
>
> I found this course extremely interesting and exciting. As a result I have begun to think about what and why I am. I have begun to define my essence.
>
> The one discouraging thing was that whenever the teacher would ask a question she would have one answer in mind. After a few wrong answers I became discouraged from raising my hand. When we did get discussions going, they were very good, though.

The one drawback was the element of time.

I learned much from this course, but I felt that I could have picked up a lot more if I didn't have philosophy first thing in the morning. Also I feel that on some of the readings I was on too low a level to understand. For this reason I did not participate in discussion as I would have liked to. The class level was extremely high.

Aside from the sheer joy of learning and of coming into contact with the authors we read, the teacher was the high point. Her unceasing, scrupulous, almost relentless probings into the material have taught me to look at my entire life differently.

It wasn't exactly what I expected. I thought we would spend our time on specific philosophers. I liked the freedom we had in class. The course helped me to question a lot of opinions that I was pretty well set on.

I think the course should be made more difficult. Not enough primary reading was required.

I found the course very valuable, especially the opportunity for independent work. My only criticism is that it was too short and condensed.

The course was most interesting when dealing with specifics. It should be given for a full year.

Probably the first time that I've actually learned something which I consider useful, relevant, etc. I found myself wanting to do the work rather than feeling obligated because of a grade.

I especially enjoyed the time spent on ethics although at the end I came out feeling less sure of my opinions.

The difficulty was different. It didn't involve hours of homework, just intense thought.

We could differ any time we wanted but were shot down if we had no good reasons.

I found many philosophers that shared my ideas and had carried them farther than I, thus helping to clear up my position.

Group Interviews. Group interviews shortly after students had taken the course yielded very similar results, with strong emphasis on the values of the discussions. Students felt they learned to listen to ideas

expressed by others and to give these views friendly but critical examination. They were surprised to discover that their personal concerns were shared by classical philosophers and that what the great thinkers had to say was relevant and helpful on personal and contemporary problems.

Ten group interviews with approximately 150 students from seven schools were tape-recorded. Essentially, the students were asked to comment on 1) the advisability of making philosophy a regular high school subject (only three said no), and 2) ways of improving the course. Some examples of their responses follow. Note that the most negative comments were embedded in suggestions for change.

1. Values in philosophy as a high school course:

   a. New insight into honest listening and sharing of ideas:

      I had a limited range of friends. In this class I was with some different students and I learned to respect their views more.

      It helps open up your mind. You see the other person's ideas so you know what he is really thinking and you find he is not just making a compromise.

      There are so many ways of thinking things out. This class keeps you alert to what people are really saying and what they really think. It helps us have real communication so we can talk about things without getting upset.

      You realize one can look at things about five or six ways so you can go to a person and say which one do you mean, this or that? You get more than one insight.

      It helps to make you listen to the other side. They may have points you never thought of before.

   b. Capacity to think and write more clearly and logically:

      It stops you from easy generalizing. The challenge helps toward clearer thought. Now I know I must think before I speak.

      A couple of times when I was very sure of myself, after class discussion I found my whole thinking was turned around on

that question. It was because I had to substantiate it with logical thinking.

If you are going to argue you have a responsibility to state your points carefully. I learned it is better not to leave holes in my argument because I get chopped down.

Class makes me re-examine my own argument, and sometimes I come out more sure of my position.

What you read in books gives you power to see it in another way.

I think this course is especially good for Black people because it makes you think deeper and not just talk of how you feel.

The logic part helped me examine my own thinking. Now I think better and write better in other courses also.

The big thing was it helped our ability to think and discuss logically.

c. New understanding of some basic ideas:

One thing I learned is that the world isn't as simple as it seems. There are a lot of things man does not know and probably will never know. It helped me in my other subjects like history and chemistry and thinking beyond. My thought process was geared up.

We always tend to accept famous men and their ideas. In this class we learned to examine them and in that way we learned to examine ourselves also.

It's not only the early thinkers but this course that makes us start looking into ourselves and start thinking about the situation the world is in now.

I could understand the world better and see the interrelatedness of things. I could see why I was taking some of the other courses. Maybe I could not give the relations specifically but there is a feeling about them. We learn to look for relations.

d. Ability to understand and confront oneself better:

So much of the stuff that was in the book could have been today. Aristotle wrote a long time ago but the same ideas apply today.

The book sort of makes you understand. It doesn't really pinpoint anything but without it things don't mean as much.

It's important to see beyond the petty things we get caught up in so much of the time.

When I got to thinking about things later I saw much more connection between the readings and what I was thinking about.

It helped us get out of the ruts of what we had been thinking.

I wouldn't want to deny anyone the right to have the vacant look on their face because a lot of people who just sit there and don't say anything may be thinking a lot and that is worth something.

e. An inquiring dialectic:

The big thing to me was that you could question things.

I think the most helpful was the open discussion in which anybody was allowed to participate. You get to hear other people's point of view and you can question them and differ with them.

The casual atmosphere helped to free us. We could discuss. Others could show what was wrong with my ideas. The whole thing was open and honest.

When you take philosophy you can see that Emerson is a kind of concrete theory, and you can see how all these different ideas grew.

It helped me not only in English but also in history and all along the line. It helped me to understand myself better and these others too.

I was glad to know about some of the great names in history, but what was more important was general stimulation of thinking. This did carry over to other courses but especially in discussions with my parents. We could talk about something important.

2. Requirements for a valuable philosophy course:

a. The teacher: Student comments are noted in Chapter VIII.

b. Mutual respect for persons and ideas among students in the class. [The seriousness of this problem was evident from frequent mention. Many students had to develop this mutual respect, and not all did so.]:

There are some kids who don't really want to be there. They just try to distract attention from the teacher to themselves, and just ruin it for somebody else.

The class seemed to be divided into two camps, an inner circle and an outer circle. Some of the outer students got bored and got way behind. The inner circle was really interested.

In my section it seemed that no one respected the opinions of others.

Some students need a lot of extra help and stimulus. Things were clear to some but not to those who did not make the extra effort.

We had to learn to respond to people who had different ideas.

The open freedom was a good thing and we learned to express ourselves and respond to other people with more of a sense of responsibility.

You said we should screen the kids. I feel strongly that would be really lousy. There is no way you can tell. I saw some come in that I thought wouldn't get anything out of philosophy, but they really did.

c. An adequate physical setting:

I did not like it. I did not like to have a thought course like that with free discussion, which was excellent, and then hold it in a regular classroom. A class like this needs an informal setting like a lounge. The formal seating and the room generally destroyed the spirit of the course.

I think it helped because we had a room where you could hang things on the wall and where there were couches falling apart.

Most classrooms are bad for discussion. You know, when you are sitting in rows it is not congenial.

d. Adaptable study aids:

I liked the way we did it this year. The study sheets would tell what to look for in the readings, and then we would discuss it in class. If you were reading this material all by yourself it would be difficult, but this way it was easy to understand.

It was helpful to have it explained how to construct a philosophical argument before we had to write papers and things.

One of the things I really needed was background on some of the major philosophers and their ideas.

3. Suggestions for improvement:

a. Start slowly:

At the beginning we need basic terminology and things like that. At first I was just sitting in the middle of these huge, fantastic words, and I really didn't understand.

It seems to me in the beginning we should have elementary steps. All of a sudden we were beginning to discuss big questions and it was over my head. Maybe if we started slow--like, how man began to think--

You can't ask a small philosophical question.

b. Put logic early:

We should have logic early so we know how to construct a good argument.

In our section the logic did not go very well because they did not study it carefully. But it did give the idea of careful thinking and influenced the rest of the course.

c. Make grades less important:

I don't see how philosophy could be graded fairly because a person's thoughts go so deep and I don't think that can be really graded.

There shouldn't be any grades because it's more important that you learn.

Let it be graded if you want a grade but don't impose grades on those that don't want them.

d. Extend the course beyond one semester:

Two years for philosophy is almost sensible because it takes you almost the full course to get into the habit of not just gulping things down.

If students could be exposed to it as freshmen and sophomores it would help them all the way through school because it helps you handle your life and that helps handle school.

There ought to be courses at four levels so a student could get into it gradually.

e. Emphasize small discussion groups:

Often the discussion was scattered and uncontrolled. This was partly because we had too many people. Better have 10 or 12.

> Couldn't the class be divided into several groups? Maybe seniors could lead small discussion groups. It might help to get everybody to really listen to what the other says.
>
> You really need the readings and lectures to make the discussions worthwhile.

Former Student Responses. Questionnaires sent in 1971 to students who had taken high school philosophy in 1968-69 or 1969-70 are tabulated in Appendix B. The strong, yet not unanimous, affirmative response follows patterns very similar to those in other student responses.

Independent Analyses

External Assistance. At the beginning of 1969-70 the staff turned to external sources for assistance with evaluation. Through the cooperation of two of the high schools in the program, help first was obtained from the Institute for Educational Research of Downers Grove, Illinois. Upon its advice the staff attempted restatement of the objectives for the program into behavioral and quantifiably testable items.

The effort met considerable skepticism. Some teachers contended that quantifiable information would reveal only the less significant aspects of the impact of philosophy and could not get at such matters as student improvement in grasp of value problems and internal restructuring of values and views of life. Others argued that objective tests would be helpful and would be balanced by other measurement approaches. Before behavioral statements were perfected, however, the Institute withdrew because of a change in its operations, and the staff did not feel able to continue development of its own objective tests without guidance.

Arrangements for an external evaluation then were made with Educational

Testing Service. An available test of "philosophic-mindedness" developed at the University of Indiana was rejected as inadequate, but two other devices were accepted. One was the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The other was a critical incidents' analysis based on student essays on personal decision-making. Both were administered at the beginning and end of fall semester 1970-71.

Unfortunately problems of student cooperation arose, especially at the close of the semester. There was especially great difficulty with the essays on decision-making incidents. Out of 450 students enrolled in the six schools using the tests, 226 provided usable pairs of Myers-Briggs Type Indicators, but only 131 provided usable pre- and post-test essays. Complete comparisons of pre- and post-essays and Indicators are contained in *Evaluation of the High School Philosophy Teaching Project* by Virgil J. O'Connor and Sandra R. Landes, submitted to the Central States College Association in April 1971.

Essay Analysis. Results from the analysis of decision essays were ambiguous. The overall pattern of score changes (on a combination of two different rating schemes) showed that "the majority of students had no significant change in their essay scores between Essay I and Essay II, a smaller group of students had a score decrease between essays, and the smallest group of students had a score increase." Notable differences from this pattern appeared in two schools. In one of these the "no change" group was greatly reduced, while in the other the number showing improved scores was twice that of those showing decreased scores. The report concluded that "the ability of students to improve their decision-making methods was not demonstrated by this evaluation technique."

The most surprising thing about these results was the decrease in scores for many cases. On general grounds this would not seem probable. There are several possible explanations for such results. First, students with high initial ratings and hence less room for gain often showed a loss, while those with low initial ratings tended to show gains. Second, comparatively little time was given during this semester to direct study of the logic of decision-making. Perhaps the expectation of indirect effects at this point was over-optimistic, and more direct analysis of choice, logic, and decision-reasoning is indicated.

Third, one semester may not be enough time for student habits of this kind to change much, although subjective reports by students claimed "much help" in clearer thinking about how to construct or criticize an argument. Fourth, there was marked student rejection of post-tests for complex reasons. As seniors, they were in the midst of both high school tests and pre-college tests and were "fed up." They noted that the Educational Testing Service was involved with pre-college tests and naively feared that these scores might be used against them. There were indications that some of the teachers sympathized with the revolt, and students caught their attitudes. Whatever the explanation, post-tests were not completed in a large number of cases. It is also possible that the device of decision-essays is not well suited to the problem.

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator showed more than expected. Here, in 226 matched pairs of replies, students from six schools showed marked increases in capacity and appreciation for introspection, in openness toward a variety of viewpoints, in appreciation of rational analysis over feeling as a basis for judgment, in freedom of

self-expression, and in cynicism toward romantic interpretations by their fellows. O'Connor and Landes said, "Many students did make some changes in attitude toward others and in perception of themselves which can be considered as positive changes. There is evidence here that the objectives of the philosophy course which have to do with attitude and perception and decision-making are achieved with many students."

Interaction Analysis. On March 14-16, 1971, Dr. Gerald Brekke, chairman of the Department of Education at Gustavus Adolphus College, visited the CSCA-Carnegie Project with three philosophy majors--Paul Hoff, John Erik Larson, and David Rights. They attended classes at three high schools, interviewed project teachers and school officers, and met with the Project Director. In each class the majors conducted interaction analyses using the instrument and method developed by Ned Flanders (Flanders, Ned A. and Amidon, Edmund J.: *The Role of the Teacher in the Classroom*, Paul S. Amidon and Associates, Minneapolis, 1967). They "assumed that the nature of philosophy would lead to a concern for truth, values, ethical considerations, proof, evidence, logical analysis, and conceptual frameworks which would stimulate organized systematic thinking and expression. If this were true, it was assumed that student discussion would be more noticeable and self-initiated."

Their detailed report of their interaction analyses and general observations led to a positive evaluation of project courses, summarized by the team as follows:

1. There was a larger proportion of student-talk than in traditional classes, suggesting that philosophy lends itself more readily to verbal exploration.

2. The teacher strategies contributed to student-talk, and to

"affective" as well as cognitive learning.

3. There was evidence that the content of the course had relevance and meaning for students, and they were not inhibited by its difficulties but stimulated.

4. Many topics engrossed students beyond the regular classroom period.

5. The success of these classes seemed to rest on the teachers' mastery of the material and ability to manage group processes and guide discussions. This might require some specific training for teachers.

Administrators' Comments

In March 1971, school administrators in closest touch with the philosophy program were asked to send letters to CSCA headquarters evaluating the work in their own school. Responses were broadly and similarly highly favorable except in the case of Lake Forest High School. Mr. James Morgan, chairman of Humanities there, made a careful statement about the special limitations under which philosophy was presented in the senior Humanities Program:

> The philosophy course was from the start a part of a team-taught Humanities course for seniors....There was not enough time for the philosopher to present, to follow up, and to complete his studies with the pupils, nor was interest high enough to carry through with more than the most basic concepts of the discipline. I speak for the good pupils here as well as for the less highly motivated. Because of either the manner of the presentation or the short amount of time allowed through the exigencies of the team offering, there was little pupil interest or following....There was never a meaningful engagement of the pupils by the instructor.
>
> If I had to go through this experiment again I would never make the philosophy offering anything but an independent program. It is clear now that at least here in Lake Forest pupils in general have either not had the necessary training to deal adequately with philosophical concepts or they are so uninterested that Herculean efforts are needed with classes five times a week to get them to move farther than the most elementary ethics or logic.
>
> I would indeed recommend a philosophy program for a high school,

> but under more usual classroom circumstances. Philosophy needs to be a subject along with other subjects in the curriculum. Today when so much "education" is actually only "bull-sessions," there is need for a philosophical presentation which will emphasize the relevant without pressing for the historical.

Comments from administrators at other schools conveyed more typical situations and responses. First, all of these officials pointed to the continuation of philosophy in the school curriculum as evidence that high school philosophy was both feasible and desirable.

> Our experience with three visiting instructors has been an excellent one and philosophy has become very popular. As a school, we are happy to go on record as favoring the inclusion of special courses in philosophy as an integral part of a high school curriculum. --- Clarence W. Hach, Supervisor of English, Evanston High School

> The philosophy classes at Hyde Park High School, and their teachers, have been among our school's most acceptable programs, to both students and teachers....We do intend to continue it at Hyde Park. -- Mrs. Anna Kolheim, Principal

> The principals and I feel that philosophy has done well at both New Trier East and New Trier West. We agree with the students that the teacher made the course. -- William H. Cornog, Superintendent

> The formal study of philosophy appears to be a valid addition to the high school curriculum for upperclass students. These students are just beginning to grapple with the broad philosophical questions to which such a course can address itself. -- Mrs. Ann Albert, Director of Instructional Services, and David H. Cox, Principal, New Trier West

> The course seems to satisfy many students, particularly in these times, in their search for values. It is perhaps as "relevant" (a much abused term) as any offering in the curriculum. More have applied than we could accommodate. -- A. Wesley Roehm, Chairman, Department of History and Social Sciences, Oak Park and River Forest High School

> As far as Highland Park High School is concerned, the program has obviously borne fruit for next year. We will have eight sections taught by Mr. Kysilko. -- H. H. Spencer, Chairman, Social Studies Department

> Since philosophy is an elective course, it seems apparent that students are picking it over a wide variety of possible alternatives. -- Marilou Denbo, Curriculum Coordinator, St. Mary Center for Learning

Second, the administrators expressed appreciation for the assistance and stimulus of the whole program, including visits by the coordinator, but noted the special importance of the teacher in the success of the program:

> We had 150 students this year who wished to take it....Part of the reason was the excellent instructor (Mrs. Meyers). -- Clarence W. Hach, Evanston.
>
> Our teacher for next year (Richard McCullough) is taking further training. He is a good person. -- Mrs. Kolheim, Principal, Hyde Park
>
> We are pleased to have Carolyn Sweers back on a part-time basis next year to help us further develop a home-grown variety of philosophy teaching....We agree with students that the teacher made the course. -- William H. Cornog, Superintendent, New Trier
>
> The teacher in residence is being, each year, more widely accepted as a resource person by our staff and finding an increasing number of calls as guest lecturer. -- Erle W. Volkland, Personnel Director, Oak Park and River Forest.

Third, the administrators noted some difficulties or dangers:

> We should like to caution that often the students who are attracted to such a course are disinclined to do the disciplined study and thinking which would make the course more than just a "rap" session. Special care must be exercised to give a structured curriculum which clearly defines the limits of their competency in philosophical areas. -- Mrs. Albert and Mr. Cox, New Trier West
>
> One danger is that students might be encouraged to question everything, leaving them without anchors or frames of reference....Much would depend on the instructor in giving balance...and time for individual conferences. -- Mr. Roehm, Oak Park and River Forest.
>
> The materials selected were in many cases too obtuse for the average student in high school....I am opposed to setting up an elite course, and I don't believe that is what CSCA had in mind either....Next year we hope to choose our materials more carefully and supervise the utilization of these materials so we can make philosophy useful to the daily life of every student...who expresses an interest. -- Dr. Spencer, Highland Park
>
> One might surmise that our young people found philosophy attractive because it was one of perhaps three possible

> courses wherein students could do some self-exploration. The present alternatives would be our humanities and sociology programs. We envision addition of psychology and possibly anthropology courses. These would also be attractive to the students now enrolled in philosophy (i.e., there will be more competition.) -- Harold J. Perry, Director of Instruction, Highland Park Township

Fourth, the administrators made some suggestions for the future. Some noted that placement of philosophy in the curriculum must be adapted to the local situation:

> I'm sure that were we not able to offer philosophy next year as an elective in our senior English program we would not be able to offer it at all....By giving English credit we will not lose the services as an English teacher of the young man who is going to teach it. -- Clarence W. Hach, Evanston.

> The philosophy program has been quite apart from the structure of the school. This has been a difficulty, especially since the St. Mary program is a total kind of experience where we try to integrate all aspects of the academic lives of the students ....We propose that it be an integral part of the total program and taught by a full-time faculty member. -- Marilou Denbo, St. Mary Center for Learning

One suggested a more extensive use of the philosophy teacher:

> Because philosophy transcends any one discipline, we believe that the philosophy teacher should be available to all departments,...not necessarily to give a lecture but to be used much in the way a film is used: to illustrate particular approaches to a problem. -- Mr. Hach, Evanston

Another suggested the possibility of including sophomores in the program:

> Just where in the chronology of their development the students should best elect this course is still an unknown. Preferably the level would seem most desirably upper classmen, but variance through selected readings might make it possible to include sophomores. -- Erle W. Volkland, Oak Park River Forest

Hence we may note that most schools will offer philosophy after the project for juniors and seniors, but Deerfield and Lyons Township, perhaps others, plan to experiment with special sophomore and freshman courses.

One administrator who worked closely with the project both within his own

school and as a member of the Project Advisory Committee, Dr. Donald Reber of Lyons Township, wrote an article about it in the *Bulletin* of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, March 1971. The concluding portion of that article gave his over-all evaluation:

> During the period of time that the experimental philosophy program existed in my schools, I had occasion to speak to many of the students....Frequently I received responses such as these: "The best course I had in this school." "If I had not had this course, I would have dropped out of school." "I feel I am now prepared to discuss with you concerns that I hold about school." In addition, many worthwhile projects emanated from the philosophy class. Among these were tutoring programs in the inner city, the collection of funds for the poor, a community project in ecology....
>
> Many of the kinds of questions raised in such a program are calling educational institutions to some very basic re-examination of themselves. Lyons Township High School is having a "philosophical year" of self-examination which goes to the roots of its educational philosophy. There are implications for all parts of the school's life. This self-examination began with a school-wide, all-day institute involving students, teachers, board members, administrators, and members of the community. The self-examination is expected to continue throughout the school year, and it is aimed at getting at the philosophical roots of the whole range of school practices and curricular offerings.
>
> Much remains to be done in this area, but the Chicago experiment is a start. Perhaps the public school can still be the arena where a revival of the kind of spirit needed to realize the full potential of every person as a complete human being can be realized.

Teachers' Comments

Evaluative comments by teachers in the project appeared in every report, in every staff meeting, and on every occasion. They were often dissatisfied with specific aspects of their own achievement, but, with one exception, none of the teachers employed by the project nor local teachers employed by the schools to supplement and continue the course came to doubt the feasibility of high school philosophy. Experience led these

teachers to question not whether but how.

The one exception was Ralph Cianchetti, who filled in for one semester at Highland Park because of over-registration. He gave a strongly negative report to the Illinois Philosophy of Education meeting in 1969. A report on some of his questions was given to the staff meeting on February 21, 1970 by James Otteson. The following points seemed most relevant:

> Load. A high school teacher with full schedule cannot invest much time in background reading, preparation, reports, etc. He needs the concrete teacher aids and guides available in other courses, rather than the open and creative approach recommended by the project.
>
> Standards. The project seems to be trying to import college standards and methods into high school inappropriately. Other teachers also resent these collegiate pretentions.
>
> Teacher Training. Again, the goals set are too high. Neither teachers nor administrators will accept the levels proposed.
>
> Subjectivity. High school philosophy tends to become a process of "cultivating subjectivity," a kind of therapeutic group dynamics thing, instead of a solid substantive course.

The staff, recognizing these as significant and not unfamiliar questions, suggested:

> Load. The problem of load and teaching materials is real, but adequate teacher preparation is the solution.
>
> Standards. Student indications are favorable to the higher standards rather than low.
>
> Teacher Training. Lower standards for either teacher preparation or class discussion would lead to unphilosophical superficiality.
>
> Subjectivity. Philosophical discussions may have therapeutic (or disturbing!) effects but this will be because of serious analysis of problems real to the student. Philosophy does not have a distinct "substantive field" for simple factual examination, but it is an approach to problems in all fields. The task is to move from emotive reactions or descriptive detail into analysis of assumptions and concepts that underlie views and conclusions ordinarily held.

The above exchange of views reflects the general rationale of high school

philosophy as held by the teachers. Charles Hollenbeck also pointed out that student criticism could itself become subject matter for analysis and understanding.

> This is an aspect which other subjects cannot duplicate, namely the willingness to examine its own presuppositions, to question its own justification, and to revise its expectations and criteria of success.

Carolyn Sweers commented in her semester report:

> What I have learned over the two years I have been with the project is that philosophy is a human activity. Philosophical questions arise out of sensitive reflections on human experience. In a beginning class, the task is to recognize the question in the various guises in which it appears, and to give students the tools for dealing with their own questions as well as guide them to those persons in the philosophical tradition who can challenge and deepen the student's emerging ideas. The success of our experiment is due in large part to the fact that Socrates is right. The unexamined life (once one tries the examined life) is not worth living.

Mike Bennett said:

> There is no longer any question regarding the academic integrity of philosophy or of student interest in it.

Richard McCullough observed:

> High school students, regardless of ability grouping, can do philosophy. Note that philosophy is a valuable addition to the curriculum rather than a substitute for something already there.

Caleb Wolfe summed up much staff discussion as follows:

1. Philosophy aids students to articulate realities with which they are involved, to identify crucial assumptions or aspects of those realities for examination, to change their perspective on their lives, and to alter and improve the ideal standards of rationality of which they are aware:

   If the teacher works diligently to make students carry the major portion of discussion in class, if the students inquire of and respond to each other, if the teacher and students look for disparity and hidden similarity between realities, if all work toward an understanding of complete evidence.

2. Philosophy aids students to enter consciously into community

with others with a sharpened awareness of being a person in community, and to work democratically with heightened awareness of what holds society together and the opportunities for direction in being together:

If the class is viewed as a working model of philosophical problems relating to persons and community, and if the discussion moves both inward toward self-identity and outward to society at large.

Summary

In summarizing, it is significant to note that evaluations from different sources are consistent with one another and with the general body of this report. They indicate that:

1. Feasibility of high school philosophy is well demonstrated.
2. Benefits to students in high school philosophy classes are multiple, often very personal, and difficult to measure objectively.
3. The difficulty of philosophical material is a real problem requiring attention, but not at all insurmountable.
4. The qualifications of the teacher are more than usually important to effectiveness.
5. A great deal of curriculum research and development remains to be done.

Chapter X

AFFIRMATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Feasibility

The initial purpose of the CSCA-Carnegie Project on High School Philosophy was stated as follows:

> The ultimate aim of this project would be to determine if the teaching of philosophy to groups of secondary school students effects in them:
>
> 1. An increased awareness of the complexity of critical judgments
>
> 2. An ability to grasp and formulate philosophical questions pertaining to man and his appraisal of values.

This report confirms the feasibility and effectiveness of high school philosophy in a variety of schools and communities using a variety of teachers. Therefore, we recommend:

1. That high schools introduce philosophy into the curriculum as soon as the necessary conditions can be met.

2. That interested and qualified persons undertake the necessary preparations to become high school philosophy teachers.

3. That colleges and universities begin preparation of high school philosophy teachers with a realistic eye to the market.

4. That research and development projects be undertaken in the field of high school philosophy.

The Shape of the Future

It is important to note that, in 1971, high school philosophy is a limited program. Teacher guides, approved books, and teaching aids are not available in ready commercial form. The number of secondary schools planning philosophy in 1971-72 is comparatively small, there are few qualified teachers, and there are very few high school philosophy teacher training

programs.

The longer-range outlook includes many significant changes. In a *Symposium on High School Philosophy* at the 1971 Western Conference on the Teaching of Philosophy, the director of this project, Hugo W. Thompson, on the basis of many conferences and extensive correspondence with high school teachers and administrators and others, made the following predictions:

> In the search for new realism and relevance, many schools will find philosophy playing a key role. Economic and social factors will prevent quick growth, but momentum will develop all through the seventies. By 1980 high school philosophy will be widely accepted, there will be teacher programs in many colleges and universities, teaching resources will be available, and the problems will be those of a new and growing profession.

1. Elements of logic will be taught much more explicitly and skillfully as part of courses in mathematics and English composition.

2. More than a thousand high schools will have modest programs of philosophy. Typical offerings will present a student some choice between three or four courses, available variously from the freshman through senior years and arranged so that many students can take at least two classes. These will not be primarily historical or systematic courses but will center on learning how to reason effectively about a variety of problems which are both vital and profound.

3. There will be new interdisciplinary courses, much more thoroughly integrated than most present "Humanities" courses. These will center on resources for student self-discovery from such fields as philosophy, psychology, sociology, biology, history and politics.

4. There will be explicit recognition and more expert treatment of philosophical issues in many other departments of the curriculum such as Art, Classics, Literature, Natural Sciences, Social Studies.

5. Secondary education will produce and promote both course content and techniques which move from storage of information in the grades, toward understanding of basic concepts and organizing these into a personal systematic framework during the middle high school years, and toward critical analysis of ideas and the structuring of values in the junior and senior years.

6. As a consequence, many college freshmen will have a philosophical sophistication rarely found today. They will have more skilled critical facility and will be a greater challenge. Also, they will be both agressive and profound in their criticism of bad teaching at the college level.

7. College philosophy departments will be involved in teacher-preparation programs at both the B.A. and M.A. levels. One danger here will be early over-production.

8. College philosophy courses will be less oriented toward Ph.D. programs and more toward the examination of life. They will differ from high school programs chiefly in being more systematic. This may mean more attention to problems of knowledge and of moral and religious life, with less of the more technical and esoteric elements, which will become the domain of advanced graduate work. We will have to learn anew how to examine simple things profoundly.

Suggestions to High Schools

Correspondence with the project shows that many high schools would like to introduce philosophy. Some now have a course and wish to improve or develop it. The problems mentioned are very similar: the availability of competent personnel, relevant material, and money.

Competent Personnel. High school teachers competent in philosophy are available, though slightly unusual procedures may be needed to secure them.

Some present high school faculty members have a fairly good background and high interest in philosophy. They now teach other subjects because jobs were available only in those fields. Most of these teachers are not fully prepared at present and need additional work in philosophy to bring them up to the needed standard. Some may not satisfy other essential requirements of temperament and certain teaching skills. But they constitute a resource worth careful exploration.

Some warnings should be noted. All of these persons will need to get up to date on current thought. This is more obvious if their background in philosophy dates back several years or had some narrow pattern or emphasis. A philosophy teacher in high school needs broad familiarity not only with classical philosophical literature but also with current literature, including popular articles as well as professional. The teacher must be sensitively aware of student concerns and be able to translate these into inquiry. He must be creatively thoughtful himself to help students pursue familiar problems to philosophical depth.

Currently, graduate students or recent Ph.D.s may be available because of market conditions in colleges. There are some among these men and women who would prefer high school teaching but have not known of openings. They are genuinely interested in teaching rather than research, in younger students, in experimental approaches. Some have a college major or minor in another subject normally taught in high school. They can be found by conferring with the department of philosophy in some good graduate school or by writing to the registry used by the American Philosophical Association:

National Registry of Philosophers
Vanguard Building
1111 Twentieth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

In addition, capable college graduates seeking teaching positions in other fields occasionally possess a strong background in philosophy. They can be identified by high school administrators who simply let their interest in philosophy be known.

Relevant Materials. Teaching materials such as conventional texts, full

syllabi, detailed teacher guides, etc. do not now exist. At present a high school philosophy teacher must develop his own patterns and materials. This demands a very competent teacher, but it keeps the course contemporary, relevant, alive, and responsive to the particular class and situation.

There are some helps available. Materials from the CSCA-Carnegie Project offer models, illustrations, bibliographies, and other suggestions. A projected Center for High School Philosophy will issue helpful materials from time to time. And college teachers of philosophy, many of them rich in teaching experience with introductory classes, will give valuable counsel to a high school colleague.

Money. Where philosophy would be a new subject in the curriculum, it would not involve added costs if the teacher filled a vacancy in which elective classes in another subject would have to be offered if philosophy were not available. The philosophy teacher would teach the usual number of classes, probably in philosophy and a second subject, and would be paid the usual salary for his qualifications. Here we are not thinking of a teacher for top-level and college-bound students. This project has demonstrated the usefulness of philosophy for all types of students. We are talking about teachers who would be part of the regular faculty and would participate fully in the life of the school.

We think it wise to make some reduction of teaching load for developing a new course and for serving as a consultant to other teachers and as a visiting lecturer in other classes. Since philosophical questions arise in many subjects, a competent philosopher can help other teachers with

reference materials and discussion suggestions and can give special lectures. Also philosophy is a key ingredient for interdisciplinary courses.

When first introduced into a high school curriculum, philosophy is a good prospect for special grants from federal agencies or local foundations. A persuasive argument can be made for its support, since it is a new subject in high school, demonstrably feasible, and potentially of wide interest.

In the current turmoil and evaluation of education, the question about any subject or aspect of education is not simply "How many dollars?" but rather "What is most important to the education of our youth for the years ahead?" In response to that question, philosophy deserves profound consideration. It can appeal to the concerns of the community for reasonableness, better communication, and attention to values. Not too much must be promised for the effects of one teacher or for two or three courses, but the addition of philosophy does move in directions desirable to the community and relevant to the student.

Suggestions to Colleges

Students Differ. Since college and university philosophy departments have been so much oriented toward college teaching, it is important to realize that preparation for high school teaching involves significantly different considerations. For one thing the age, mood, and interests of high school students are significantly different even from those of college freshmen. One of the project teachers, Carolyn Sweers, explored this point with the Western Conference on the Teaching of Philosophy as follows:

> The intensity of the age period and the disruptive effect it frequently has on previous behavior patterns leads to some difficulty

> in discussing certain basic issues of social philosophy and religion...The sixteen to eighteen-year-old knows first hand that to be an "I" is to be unlike anything else. Discussions of the nature of the self frequently have an insightful dimension which one might not expect to find in persons so young. This can lead to a tightly held relativism, refusing to recognize any standard of truth higher than their own opinion. Exposure to philosophical material leads to growing commitment to reason...Students of this age group are existential in orientation. They do not seem able or willing to sustain interest in theoretical or technical aspects of philosophy except as they become aware that this material relates to their concerns. It would seem that the experience of the high school student is not unlike the human experience out of which philosophy began. It has the same driving curiosity. It is a situation ripe for reason.

Contexts Differ. There are also important differences in the context of the high school and college educational experience. The high school student lives at home, more closely under parental authority. He lives in the community where he grew up and is known by his own age group, his church associates, and others. His school is a much more tightly structured and closely supervised educational environment than college, even in progressive high schools. He has less time or opportunity to do homework and often carries a completely full schedule for the school day. This means, of course, that high school philosophy methods and materials must be strikingly different from those conventionally used in colleges and universities.

Teacher Preparation. A college or university proposing a program of preparation for high school philosophy teachers must first determine whether it has or can create the necessary components. Current offerings in many philosophy departments are much too narrowly oriented to give an adequate base for high school philosophy. Similarly, many education departments do not emphasize the understanding and skill with group process which is basic to dialectic discussion. Next, certification

requirements in relevant states must be fulfilled. Practical problems will include availability of competent instruction in materials and methods of teaching high school philosophy, supervision of student teaching, and convenient availability of high schools where such teaching could take place. Finally, the available market must be reviewed. Long-range probabilities favor expansion at moderate speed, but it would be tragic to give many young philosophers expectations for jobs unavailable when they are.

The staff of the project concerned itself very deeply with the problem of teacher preparation. Two of them made the following suggestions at the Western Conference on the Teaching of Philosophy:

> It is particularly urgent that the basic philosophical tools we give our students be sharpened with two purposes in mind. The first of these is the need for competence in handling the historical and analytical dimensions of philosophy; this need appears to be the strength of most current programs. The second is the need to apply these tools to the pressing living issues facing men today; this need appears by contrast to be the greatest single weakness of most programs today.
>
> Second, excellence in the teaching of philosophy requires that we give far greater attention than we do at present to engaging the student in both the discussion and the teaching of philosophy. Over-emphasis upon the lecture method of teaching in both undergraduate and graduate education tends to be widely emulated by new teachers, with the result that they are ill-equipped for the crucial task of learning with the student. The art of philosophizing with others can and ought to be taught.
>
> Third, the widespread tendency to restrict the student's perceptual horizon to the spoken and written word must be resisted by a much broader notion of this horizon. The use of films, recordings, tapes, etc. tends to enrich rather than impoverish the student's awareness of subject matter. -- Paul Bosley
>
> The role of philosophy in high school should not be narrowly delimited. As soon as we allow philosophy to be defined by a static curriculum with a required set of readings and a single prescribed methodology, it will lose its unique significance as a discipline of open and shared inquiry. Teachers must be free as philosophy itself is free continually to re-examine and

> redefine the role of high school philosophy courses. For this reason, the burden of responsibility on the teacher is greater than that in other subjects both to keep inquiry open and to maintain high standards of rationality in discourse. Thus, I would suggest that in addition to the formal preparation, a good high school philosophy teacher would possess the integrity and the diligence to continually re-examine his responsibility to his students; and he would possess the commitment which would allow him to work with colleagues and administrators to keep the course open and free of static limitations. -- Charles Hollenbeck

Other Teachers. Staff members of the CSCA-Carnegie Project became increasingly aware that philosophical questions are discussed in a great variety of high school classes. Some incomplete studies of this problem showed that individual teachers in a wide variety of fields often entered into what they considered philosophical discussions with students or they referred to philosophical writers. Some, by their very notion of what was philosophical, revealed superficiality or distortion. Many expressed a wish for help because they sensed that the issues are very real to the students and appropriate to their own course. Those that had an introductory or history of philosophy course in college were more fortunate than those who, in college, were unaware or unconvinced of the need for philosophy. It appears to the staff that colleges should consider offering a tailored philosophy course to prospective teachers and to present high school teachers who are aware of their need for more philosophical background.

Unfinished Business

Building on Foundations. The CSCA-Carnegie Project demonstrated the possibility and advisability of introducing philosophy as a regular high school subject. It tested a variety of materials and methods. Its results support the experience of many individuals who previously

experimented with high school philosophy in several places.

Now the weakness of previous efforts must be avoided. Effective support must be obtained from professional philosophers and leaders in secondary education. Widespread adoption of philosophy by high schools must be encouraged and facilitated. Curriculum materials must be produced. And research must explore the full potentialities and limitations of philosophy in secondary and earlier education.

Center for High School Philosophy. A well-funded communications, resource, and research center would be the most helpful next step in promoting high school philosophy. Such a center should perform at least the following functions:

1. Communications. The proposed Center for High School Philosophy should provide a clearinghouse for information about resources, research, standards, certification, etc. in the field. It should publish a newsletter devoted to current news and thought about high school philosophy. It should publicize the program and seek appropriate recognition of its practitioners and their contributions.

2. Consultation. In addition to the daily work of handling inquiries and making referrals, the Center should provide consultative help by qualified persons like the staff of the CSCA-Carnegie Project to high schools desiring to introduce philosophy, to colleges and universities planning training programs, and to those considering research in the field.

3. Conferences. The Center should bring together in annual conferences those interested and involved in high school philosophy. It should

simultaneously stimulate local and regional meetings, encouraging major city educational systems, groups of high schools, college consortia, and universities to host conferences which give educators and philosophers opportunity to monitor and foster high school philosophy.

4. Training. The Center should work with graduate schools and teacher-training institutions in providing appropriate courses, workshops, institutes, and in-service training to many professional persons involved one way or another in high school philosophy--high school teachers desiring to re-tool for philosophy teaching, other high school teachers desiring a better grasp of the uses of philosophy in their work, administrators and curriculum consultants, prospective teachers, college philosophy and education faculties, and others.

5. Curriculum Work. The Center should produce a wide variety of learning resources and teaching guides for high school philosophy courses. Files of the CSCA-Carnegie Project include a rich initial lode of raw material for refinement and use, but much additional writing, editing, teaching, and production is needed. Some of the needed materials are:

...Varieties of course patterns and strategies for various situations.

...Clarified objectives and standards that are reasonably attainable, observable, and testable.

...Collections of readings with introductory background and study suggestions, arranged in units that could be used or combined in various ways.

...Bibliographies, adequately annotated, for use by teachers, school libraries, and community libraries as well as by students.

...Audio-visual and other teaching aids such as motivational and

opinion-finding devices, programmed learning units, and project material for individualized study.

...Specific units for use in connection with other subjects to assist teachers in English, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural and Social Sciences, and the Fine Arts to deal more adequately with philosophical implications.

...Teaching suggestions. The CSCA-Carnegie Project indicates that conventional approaches often are not advisable and certainly are not enough. Not only do classroom procedures need creative exploration but the best ways of communicating these suggestions to teachers need development.

...Evaluation instruments and procedures for use with individual students as part of their own education, and instruments and procedures for testing the effectiveness of particular courses or portions of courses.

6. Experimentation. Because it will not be possible to develop more sophisticated instructional systems without testing them carefully in classrooms, the Center should arrange with many schools to test various combinations of philosophical materials and methods under a variety of conditions. For example, since the CSCA-Carnegie Project operated in schools of the inner city and of the affluent suburbs, some future testing should be aimed at middle and lower income areas of the "blue collar" type, areas with a strong rural or small-town background, and a variety of non-public schools. Also, since philosophy classes to date have been conducted primarily for high school juniors and seniors and often have been confined to top-level-ability students (though not in the CSCA-Carnegie Project), much future experimentation should be aimed at 9th and 10th graders, perhaps also 8th and 7th graders. Moreover, adaptations seem possible and should be tested for non-college-bound students and lower ability students.

A major experimental project, including classes, curriculum development

and interdisciplinary teacher training, might be conducted in Philosophy of Science. Philosophy of Religion might succeed in high schools where historical or comparative approaches do not. Interdisciplinary courses such as Humanities should be re-examined in the light of the promising role of philosophy. And philosophical elements in a wide range of high school courses should be explored and developed.

7. Standards. The Center should foster high standards for courses and teachers of high school philosophy, since superficiality would quickly kill the whole program. It is highly important that agreement be reached by high schools, teacher-training institutions, professional associations, and accrediting agencies on appropriate norms for philosophy courses and teachers. This report includes a number of suggestions. Project staff members are deeply concerned that any standardization should leave room for creative adaptation in methods and materials. Standards should stimulate, not restrict.

Final Word. Thus, challenging opportunities lie ahead for a substantial resource and research center for high school philosophy. The CSCA-Carnegie Project has demonstrated conclusively that philosophy can make a major contribution to secondary education. The Project staff, therefore, urges that a Center be established to assure fulfillment of this rich potentiality.

Appendix A

STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF HIGH SCHOOL PHILOSOPHY COURSES

The following questionnaire was used all three years in the CSCA-Carnegie Project on High School Philosophy to obtain student evaluations at the end of every philosophy course taught in the Project. Although earlier forms of the questionnaire were worded somewhat differently, most items were substantially the same. Figures inserted in the questionnaire show the percentage of students in all Project courses all three years who checked this response.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENT EVALUATION

OF A PHILOSOPHY COURSE

CSCA Philosophy Teaching Project

Do not sign your name. Male_____ Female_____

School_____ Junior_____ Senior_____

Instructions. Indicate your answer to each question by a check mark (✓) at an appropriate point on the rating scale line. Check above the position which best describes your opinion. Sometimes you may wish to mark between stated positions. When it would be appropriate to check more than one point to indicate your views, this will be indicated.

Please do write comments or give examples. Use the other side of the sheet to extend comments.

Thank you for cooperating!

- -

I. General

1. I understood the objectives of the course fairly well.

(6	28	43	23)
never	by the end	early in the course	from previous descriptions

This purpose is:

2. The purpose, as I understand it, was accomplished.

(2	20	57	21)
not at all	little	pretty well	excellently

3. Student responsibilities were clearly defined.

5	10	53	32
never	not enough	sometimes	always

4. The difficulty of the readings, tests, etc. compared with other subjects, was

15	41	34	10
beyond me	difficult	like other courses	very easy

5. Compared with other subjects, the value of this course was

2	7	44	47
very little	less than most	better than most	best of all

II. Class Process

6. The course was well planned.

4	4	56	36
poor plan	too structured	very flexible	efficiently organized

7. Freedom in class discussion

3	7	51	39
sadly absent	gave little guidance	helped open attitudes	promoted creative thought

8. Individual freedom on papers and projects

0	11	63	26
no freedom	caused confusion	allowed me to express myself	promoted creative thought

9. Students argued with others in class

6	14	50	30
heatedly and personally	with vigorous self-defense	tolerant of different views	rationally & without hostility

10. Students could differ with teacher or readings

0	2	26	72
not at all	if they liked to live dangerously	only with very good reasons	freely at any time

11. Lectures and discussions about philosophers and philosophical issues

7	17	45	31
left me confused	helped grasp but not interest	gave some understanding	gave grasp and enthusiasm

12. Class discussions of contemporary problems

2	6	42	50
were irrelevant	were not satisfying	helped broader understanding	gave new insights

13. Class was spoiled by a few students who (check as many as apply)

30	13	22	35
did not really cooperate	put others down	talked without thinking	talked too much

III. Readings and Assigned Work

14. The total work required was

10	10	47	23
little and I learned little	fair, but unevenly distributed	about right	fair and well distributed

15. Papers and quizzes were

22	2	50	26
not enough for stimulus	too many and/or too long	reasonable, but routine	very helpful and stimulating

16. Assigned readings were

5	19	24	52
uninteresting, irrelevant	beyond my comprehension	easy enough	hard but rewarding

17. The standards and expectations were

9	2	50	38
unclear, inconsistent	unreasonably high	clear and reasonable	challenging

18. Critical comments or praise by teachers or class were

3	8	27	62
non-existent	unfair	too negative	fair and helpful

IV. The Teacher

19. The teacher conveyed the objectives of the course

6	7	41	46
said nothing about aims	tried but unclear	with partial success	very clearly

20. Assignments and schedule were clear and fair.

19	4	16	61
too vague	unclear and unfair	clear but unfair	clear and fair

21. The teacher encouraged free expression in discussion.

1	3	22	74
all must agree	discouraged freedom	freedom on some not all views	even when differ

22. The teacher is sensitive to student reactions.

0	1	19	80
unaware	misinterprets	adapts	very responsive

23. The teacher respects views and concerns of all students.

2	2	51	45
belittles	plays favorites	listens receptively	flexible in response

24. The teacher is actively helpful to students.

2	3	33	62
indifferent	seems too busy	adjusts assignment to individuals	open to personal conversation

25. The teacher inspires confidence.

1	17	30	52
unsure of himself	lectures helpfully	knows the subject	competent and enthusiastic

26. Lectures have been

3	10	49	38
dull	too many or too long	competent but uninteresting	inspiring

27. The teacher makes everything relevant to student interests.

2	7	45	46
misinterprets relevance	too few illustrations	about as much as expected	in exciting ways

V. Summary--Results of the Course

28. My interest in philosophy has become such that (answer as many as apply)

3	32	60	5
I am discouraged	I will study by myself	I would like to take more courses	I hope to major

29. From this course I have gained

(2	4	59	35)
nothing important	only familiar ideas	much to think about	ideas that changed my whole outlook

30. I have gained new skills

(5	30	38	27)
can pretend impressively	to respect and discuss ideas	better logical thinking	critical analysis

31. The best features of the course were:

32. The worst features of the course were:

33. I would suggest the following changes:

34. The readings most helpful to me were:

Appendix B

FORMER STUDENTS RESPOND

TO HIGH SCHOOL PHILOSOPHY

On March 11, 1971, questionnaires were sent to 627 students who had taken philosophy in high school during the preceding academic years, 1968-69 and 1969-70. The tabulations below summarize 253 replies received by May first. In most cases letters went to home addresses and were forwarded to the college address. The student paid postage on his reply. Nine letters were returned undelivered. There was no followup appeal or study of non-response.

Questionnaires went to students from five out of the ten schools involved in the experimental project, largely because it proved easier to obtain addresses for these students than for those from other places. It is assumed that replies represent a fair sample from all schools. The classes were taught by different persons in the different years. There were statistically significant differences in replies to some questions, apparently depending most upon the teacher involved, but the overall impact of the replies carries the same balance throughout. It was notable that many students who tended to respond negatively on the first twelve questions had favorable comments on open questions 14 and 15. In a very few cases this pattern was reversed.

In recording replies to questions 13, 14, and 15, the categories were developed by the compilers.

	COMMENT	RESPONSE		
		Agree	Uncertain	Disagree
1.	Philosophy class gave opportunity to share important ideas with fellow students.	201	31	19
2.	It helped me to think more logically.	135	48	68

	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree
3. It helped me to think more carefully and deeply.	186	27	36
4. It helped me to understand better some of the great ideas on which our civilization is grounded.	159	38	53
5. It helped me to understand and confront myself more realistically.	127	43	79
6. It created confusion in my mind about			
(a) myself	103		115
(b) moral values	115		100
(c) religion	102		110
(d) (other topics).		89	
7. It plunged me over my depth in new ideas and/or criticisms of views I formerly held.	74	47	125
8. It stimulated my interest in philosophy so I plan to do more study in the field. (111 students listed college philosophy courses.)	165	28	46
9. It helped me to have more respect for other persons and for views differing from my own.	158	42	50
10. I did not see what the course intended to accomplish, nor am I sure what it really did for me.	26	26	188
11. Compared to most other courses in high school, philosophy was definitely more difficult, as to:			
(a) readings	168		66
(b) lectures	69		149
(c) discussions	87		138
(d) papers and assignments.	92		128
12. Compared to most other courses in high school philosophy was more valuable to me.	164	38	48

13. I would suggest the following topics, concerns, or problems as most important for high school philosophy to examine:

(a) Meaning of life, self, self-identity, the good life, personal value systems — 85

(b) Philosophy of religion, God, religiousness, other faiths, Eastern religions — 60

(c) Fundamental philosophical problems, reality, freedom, man — 51

(d) Ethical issues: marriage and sex, war and peace, violence, concern for others 65

(e) Political philosophies, including economic systems 33

(f) Existentialism 34

(g) Education: purposes, methods, role of philosophy, psychology, fellow student interest, parental understanding 15

(h) Logic, methodology, problems of knowledge 31

(i) Ideas of great men, history of philosophy (classical philosophies to contemporary problems) 47

(j) Contemporary philosophies, application of classical philosophies to contemporary problems 60

(k) In depth study of one or several areas 14

14. The best features of high school philosophy, as I remember it, were:

(a) Teacher and class methods 68

(b) Informal atmosphere, involvement of class 35

(c) Readings and assignments 64

(d) Discussion, skillfully led, variety yet structured, openness 121

(e) Films and teaching resources, guest speakers 11

(f) New ideas, organizing own thinking, looking at both sides of issues 59

(g) Specific topics, readings 15

15. The worst features of high school philosophy, as I remember it, were:

(a) Not enough time, covered too much material 48

(b) Not enough structure, organization of course 19

(c) Grades, papers, assignments 45

(d) Readings too difficult, not enough logic, did not understand teacher 41

(e) Teacher attitude, too one-sided, hampered by community 17

(f) Problems in class--disinterested students, discussions dull or bogged down, intolerance of others' ideas 68

Appendix C

READINGS FOR HIGH SCHOOL PHILOSOPHY

In the course of the 1968-71 CSCA-Carnegie Project in Chicago readings were used in three ways: 1) as books purchased by students, with selections studied in some detail; 2) as handouts given the class for discussion, usually either articles from periodicals or short selections from books; 3) as references made available in the school library. These lists are here combined and listed alphabetically according to author without any attempt to classify content.

This list is neither complete nor necessarily the best books for high school use. Many accidents of availability and preference are reflected. Only appropriate selections were drawn from most of the books. These are materials that were used by two or more teachers in the project and rated useful by their students.

Aristotle: *Ethics*, I, II, VIII, and X, and selections dealing with the Four Causes

Austin, J.: *How To Do Things With Words*

Barnes, Hazel: *Humanistic Existentialism*

Bentham, J.: "The Good As Pleasure," in *An Introduction To The Principles of Morals and Legislation*

Berkeley, G.: *Principles of Human Knowledge*

Black, Max: *Critical Thinking*

Blanchard, Brand: "Morality and Politics," in *Ethics and Society*

Bond, David J.: "The Fact-Value Myth," *Social Education*, February 1970

Boulding, Kenneth: *The Image*, especially "Introduction"

Broad, C. D.: *Five Types of Ethical Theory*

Brownowski, J.: *Science and Human Values*

Buber, M.: *Writings of Martin Buber*, W. Herberg, editor

Burtt, E. A.: *Types of Religious Philosophy*

Camus, A.: *The Myth of Sisyphus*

Choron, J.: *Romance of Philosophy*

Copi, I.: *Introduction to Logic*

Copleston, F. C.: *History of Philosophy*, 8 vol.

Cornford, F. M.: *Before and After Socrates*

Descartes, R.: *Meditations*, especially Books I and II

Edwards, Paul, Ed.: *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 8 vol.

Eiseley, L.: *The Unexpected Universe*

Epictetus: *Enchiridion*

Flew, A.: *Body, Mind, and Death*

Fletcher, J. F.: *Situation Ethics*

Frankel, Charles: *The Case for Modern Man*

Frankfort, H. and H.A.: "The World of Primitive Man," in *Before Philosophy*

Frankl, Viktor: *Man's Search For Meaning*

Fromm, Erich: *Marx's Concept of Man*

Frost, S. F.: *Basic Teaching of the Great Philosophers*

Girvetz, H. K.: *Contemporary Moral Issues*

Hackman, G. G., Kegley and Nikander: *Religion in Modern Life*

Hill, T. E.: *Contemporary Theories of Knowledge*

Hobbes, Thomas: *Leviathan*

Holbach, Baron: "Determinism," in *In Search of Self and Identity*

Honer, S. M. and Hunt: *Invitation to Philosophy*

Hook, S.: "The War Against the Democratic Process," *Atlantic Monthly*, February 6, 1969

Hume, David: *An Inquiry Concerning the Human Understanding*, especially Section IV

Huxley, Aldous: "Where Do You Live?," *Esquire Magazine*, May 19, 1956

Huxley, Julian: "The Crisis in Man's Destiny," *Playboy*, January 1967

Hyde, W. D.: *Five Great Philosophies of Life*

Jaspers, K.: *The Perennial Scope of Philosophy*

James, William: *The Will to Believe and Other Essays*

Kaufmann, Walter: *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre*

Locke, John: *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* and *On Civil Government*

MacQuarrie, J.: "Presuppositions of Human Freedom," in *Principles of Christian Theology*

Mill, J. S.: *On Liberty*

Mumford, L.: "Origins of Metaphysical Thinking," in *The Story of Utopias*

Niebuhr, Reinhold: *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, Introduction

Nietzsche, F.: "The Good as Power," in *The Portable Nietzsche*

Noss, J. B.: *Man's Religions*

Malcolm X: *Malcolm Speaks*

Ruby, L.: *The Art of Making Sense*

Russell, B.: *A History of Western Philosophy* and *Basic Writings*

Sartre, J.P.: *No Exit and Other Plays*

Smith, H.: "The Revolution in Western Thought," *The Saturday Evening Post*, August 26, 1961

Thilly, F. and Wood: *A History of Philosophy*

Thompson, Hugo W.: "Love the Power of Ethics," in *Love-Justice*

Tillich, Paul: "The Lost Dimension of Religion," *The Saturday Evening Post*, June 14, 1958

Tillich, Paul: "Man, Self, and the World," in *Systematic Theology*, Vol. I

Titus, H.H.: *Ethics for Today and Living Issues in Philosophy*

Whitehead, A.N.: *Anthology*

Wild, John: "The Life-World vs. the Objective Universe," in *Existence and the World of Freedom*

Urmson, J. O., ed.: *The Concise Encyclopedia of Western Philosophy and Philosophers*